DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 126 CS 500 101

AUTHOR	Hall, Robert N., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Seminar of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication (1st, Chicago, July 6-8, 1972).
INSTITUTION	Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	60p.; Bulletin of the Assn. of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication; Issue No. 2, p1-60, Jan. 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; Career Opportunities; Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Educational Accountability; Faculty Evaluation; Graduate Study; *Program Evaluation; *Speech Curriculum; *Unions

ABSTRACT

This publication is the second issue of the quarterly bulletin published by the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication (ADASC), and contains the proceedings of the organization's first annual seminar in July 1972. Part I deals with current trends in speech communication on the graduate, undergraduate, and community college levels. Part II reprints addresses that deal with departmental organization, curriculum change, and professional accountability. Part III presents statements on the subject of unionization and its effects on higher education and departmental administration. Part IV is a synthesis of the first three sections, with three papers on faculty evaluation, program evaluation, and the role of ADASC in evaluation processes. Finally, four position papers are reprinted, on the subjects of consulting services, personnel evaluation, faculty exchange, and program evaluation. (RN)

ED 071126

BULLETIN
OF THE
Association of Departments & Administrators in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

ada sc

National Office:
STATLER HILTON HOTEL
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10001
(212) PE 6-6625

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Issue #2

January, 1973

IN THIS ISSUE

Proceedings of the First Annual Seminar

Part I Current Trends in Speech Communication 2
Graduate Study and Research, *Herman Cohen* 3
Undergraduate Education and Teaching Programs, *Robert Vogelsang* 6
Speech Communication in Community Colleges, *Arthur C. Meyer* 9

Part II Seminar Addresses 13
Departmental Organization and Curriculum Change, *Michael F. Shugrue* 14
Professional Accountability, *Robert N. Hall* 18

Part III Higher Education and Unionization 21
Letter from American Federation of Teachers, *John A. Bart[illegible]* 22
Statement from the NEA, *Edward F. Bontempo* 23
The Relevant Question, HOW?, *Anita Taylor* 24
The Impact of Collective Bargaining on College and University Organization and Governance, *L. Leroy Cowperthwaite* 26
Higher Education and Unionization, *James E. Roever* 32

Part IV Implications of Faculty Organization and Accountability 40
Evaluation of the Faculty, *Robert C. Jeffrey* 41
Evaluation of Academic Programs, *Samuel L. Becker* 46
ADASC and the Evaluation Process, *Ernest E. Ettlich* 51

Part V Position Papers 54

About the Authors 59

THE PROCEEDINGS

The First Annual Seminar of the ADASC was held at the Palmer House in Chicago on July 6, 7, and 8, 1972. It brought together over seventy-five communication arts and sciences chairmen or administrators to discuss four problem areas facing the profession: current trends in speech, unionization, accountability, and the implications of unionization and accountability. From the discussions the position papers evolved. The position papers in turn were reviewed at the Annual Meeting in Chicago in December. The proposed action steps for implementation of the papers will be reported in a future issue of the BULLETIN.

All of the papers presented at the Seminar are included here except those dealing with "Accountability in Speech Communication Programs." It is the hope of the Editor that those papers will be available sometime in the future. The omission of these papers is regrettable but unavoidable.

PART I

CURRENT TRENDS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

The speech communication field is a young profession in terms of the organization of the academic world. It is because of that youth, perhaps, that the field appears to be in flux. From the classical rhetorical tradition of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, as a profession we have moved into such diverse areas as psycho-linguistics, the behavioral sciences, and mass communication. Undoubtedly the areas of pre-adolescent speech training, speech for the underprivileged, and speech in the urban center will soon come into our purview of the field. To keep abreast of the rapidly expanding trends in our profession is not always easy. For that reason the ADASC chose to explore current trends in speech communication.

The trends were reviewed from three points of view. Herman Cohen looks at and does some evaluating of the trends in graduate study and research. Robert Vogelsang concentrates on what is happening to speech courses on the undergraduate level. Arthur Meyer, through the use of research completed to date on a doctoral dissertation, looks at the field from the perspective of the community college.

Reactions to these views and/or reports on other trends are welcomed. The profession will prosper and advance only if it moves as a unit. Being aware of developing trends certainly should be an aid to everyone concerned with speech communication.

GRADUATE STUDY AND RESEARCH

Herman Cohen

Sometime in the late 1950's the field of Speech Communication began to become aware that it faced serious problems. At first the concern was not widespread, but gradually it became increasingly clear that the traditional rhetorical analyses we were accustomed to using were no longer effective enough or sufficient enough to explain the rhetorical phenomena we were observing. Not only were we forced to deal with communicative events different from those we had been concerned with in the past, we also found that our classical theories were insufficient as a means of explaining even public speaking events to ourselves and to others.

As we were becoming aware of our deficiencies, we noticed that other disciplines were already addressing themselves to problems of communication. As we had continued in our traditional ways, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, linguists and other social scientists had been doing sophisticated research in many aspects of communication. Our reaction to this discovery was panic at the revelation that many of the questions we should have been asking about communications were already being asked by social scientists.

In our desperation to catch up in order to know which questions to ask, we spread our nets rather indiscriminately and gathered in a lot of methodology and some of the theories of the social sciences. Unfortunately, few of us had the background to understand the assumptions and rationale of other social scientists. Nor did we always understand that their objectives were not identical with ours.

One of the results of our infatuation with the communication theories of the social sciences was that we thoughtlessly began to discard much of what we had been thinking and teaching simply because it was old and traditional. Even though our rhetorical theory was not very well developed, we were now left without a central body of theory to inform our research and graduate teaching.

The rejection of much that was old was by no means all bad or even dominantly bad. We were forced to re-examine our assumptions and we discarded much that was simplistic, naive, obsolete and prescriptive. We also began to ask ourselves who we really were and we began to try to define our teaching and research responsibilities. At least we knew we were no longer exclusively or largely concerned with the teaching of public speaking and the study of dead orators.

It is not entirely coincidental that during this re-examination we began to restructure our departments. The old eclectic Department of Speech seemed to be lacking in central purpose and it was not surprising that,voluntarily or otherwise, we began to disengage ourselves from the Theatre and Speech Pathology and Audiology units in our departments. Our rejection of our traditional role also, at least in part, explains the widespread changes in the names of our professional associations and departments.

In retrospect, it now seems that we would have been well advised to set ourselves to the task of redeveloping our own theory. Instead we relied on the theory building of the social sciences, often applying them to problems different from those of the originators of the theories, or shifting our own questions so that they conformed with the theories.

In itself, the use of theories borrowed from other disciplines is not an academic sin. As the lines between disciplines have become less distinct, theories and methods are freely borrowed. Our problem is that we have borrowed so unquestioningly that we do not always know which theories are appropriate for our objectives and why. Moreover, if we are to have any validity and definition as a discipline we must be engaged in theory building appropriate to our unique interests. Otherwise, we are bound "never a lender but always a borrower to be" and destined always to be a derivative field.

The derivative character of our theory has led us to become a discipline without a theoretical or operational center. Perhaps, to put it charitably, we have become a multi-centered discipline. I have heard an eminent sociologist refer to Speech Ph.D's as "undifferentiated social scientists." I have also heard a Graduate Dean describe our field not as a discipline but as an "inter-disciplinary subject." Such remarks indicate that others have the same problem we do in recognizing the centrality of our field and the theoretical bases from which we work.

One of the more unfortunate consequences of our confusion is that it helped bring about the silly and meaningless dispute between "communications" and "rhetoric." This unnecessary quarrel would have been prevented had we been more certain about our theoretical base. Fortunately, our profession has been wise in responding to the proliferation of knowledge and loss of centrality by holding the New Orleans and Pheasant Run Conferences in which we have, with some success, begun to redefine our objectives and methods.

In spite of the antiquity of our field and in spite of the retention of much that is valuable, we now have many of the characteristics of a young discipline. Like many immature disciplines we have borrowed from other fields. At the same time, we are deficient in the understanding of the theoretical rationale for our borrowings. We, as a discipline, are very weak in our philosophical base. As a field, we know very little about the philosophy of science--particularly the philosophy of the social sciences. Because "method" is easier to understand than "philosophy" or "theory" we have tended to place our emphasis on method rather than on its theoretical or philosophical foundation.

Most of us are ill prepared to theorize since we have not engaged in theory building nor do we know much about it. Many of us are not even able to recognize a theory. Often, in fact, we treat empirical generalizations and sometimes mere speculations as if they are theories. For the most part, we have no one but ourselves to blame for this deficiency. While we were in our dormant stage the Festingers, Osgoods, Lewins, Bales, Homans et al were asking the questions we should have been asking, building theories which we should have been building. When we awoke we embraced their work guiltily and too unquestioningly. We became rhetorical Maoists--we let a thousand theories blossom and we chose whatever seemed applicable.

Because our theories and methods are so derivative and because of our lack of theoretical and philosophical foundations, we have difficulty in determining what is our unique or different perspective towards communication. We are all aware that our research will overlap with other fields but we should be able to differentiate between the major focus of the work we do and the work being done in other fields. It is not necessary that we change what we are doing but we should know why we are doing it.

The situation I have described has serious implications for our training of graduate students. For the past 10 to 15 years, we have transmitted theories and methods to our graduate students. They suffer from the same deficiencies we do. By now many of our former students are themselves teaching graduate students and visiting our sins into the next generation.

A major change will be necessary before we will be able to break this endless circle. We need to devote much more of our research time and our graduate teaching to theory building. This task will be long, painstaking, and uncomfortable--but it must be done. It will require that we devote ourselves to formulating the theoretical and philosophical basis of our discipline, both in the social sciences and the humanities. This task must be the responsibility of mature scholars, not graduate students. In due course we will produce graduate students who will be able to continue our theory building and who will be able to provide greater centrality.

The job of theory building will not be an easy one nor should we expect that all of us will engage in it. Not all of us are blessed with the insight and the

speculative minds which are necessary. Theories in Speech-Communication are slippery. They become so intertwined with other aspects of behavior that we may have problems of delimitation. We may also succumb to the hopeless desire that we will find a master theory to explain all communicative phenomena. We may also overstress the importance of theorizing and make it an end in itself and neglect the important task of training our graduate students to collect and criticize data of all kinds. Where we have until now substituted method for theory, we may not neglect method for theory.

Partly because the lines between our field and others are so blurred, we need to encourage ourselves, our colleagues, our graduate students and those in other disciplines to plan interdisciplinary research projects--including team dissertations. The combination of possible fields is extremely diverse.

In spite of all I have said, I am not in the least pessimistic. We are, to be sure, in search of our identity but we have given up our old naive and spurious identity. We are engaged in more serious research than ever before. Our dissertations are much better. Our graduate students are much more sophisticated. Our graduate curricula, though chaotic, are more innovative and relevant. We have begun to gain some respect with other fields. We are frustrated but our frustration is healthy. We are far stronger than we ever were. As we achieve maturity, central focus and unity we will be stronger still.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND TEACHING PROGRAMS

Robert Vogelsang

Introduction

This survey was conducted in June, 1972 at the request of the President of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication (ADASC), an affiliate organization of the Speech Communication Association.

One hundred and twenty-five institutions were selected from the 1972 SCA membership directory. This constituted an average of 2 institutions per state. More than two survey instruments were sent to populous states such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and California.

Three criterion measures were used in selecting a school: 1) Was the listed chairman a member of SCA?; 2) Did the institution have a training program in Speech Communication (as listed in the SCA Directory?); 3) Was the training institution a four year school?

A single page survey questionnaire, printed on both sides, was written for the project. The investigator had the invaluable assistance of Professor Ted Grove in originating the instrument and Professor Larry Steward in analyzing the data.

Due to the time of the year (June) and the necessity for rapid returns the survey instrument was kept brief, asking 8 questions. Questions 1 and 4 broke down into a number of subordinate parts.

A personal typed letter was sent to each departmental chairman in the sample with the survey questionnaire and a post paid business reply envelope.

Within two weeks from the date of mailing the questionnaires 56 institutions had replied to the survey. Two of the replies were not useable in that one program had been discontinued and the other, the person critiqued the worth of the survey and the instrument as such.

The 54 useable returns represented 43% of the original 125 institutions in the sample. The profession of Speech Communication is in the debt of our gracious colleagues who took the time to respond to the instrument--they have given us extensive, representative data. General information will be found in this report and specific data will be forthcoming in a later article.

With the return of the 54 responses it was interesting to observe how well regions of the country were represented: The East--10 colleges and universities; the Midwest--17 institutions; the South--11 schools; and the West--17 schools.

The Survey Instrument

Question I

Question I asked, "In your undergraduate curriculum how many courses being taught in the present academic year fall within one or another of the following categories in terms of relative emphasis?" The courses inquired about ranged from Public Address through Intercultural Communication and Minority Studies. The categories were described as "skill" or "theory" or "mixed"emphases.

One thousand two hundred and eighty-seven courses were reported as a total for this question. The respondents cited 550 theory courses, more than any other course type.

Question I

Categories	Number of Courses	Per Cent of Total
Skill Oriented	302	23.48%
Theory Oriented	550	42.86%
Mix Oriented	219	16.98%
Other - (e.g., Mass Comm., Listening, Minority Studies)	216	16.68%
TOTAL	1,287	100.00%

In the "other" category in Question I such courses as "Listening" appeared with 10 of the responding 54 schools citing such a course; "Minority Studies" being taught at 22 of the 54 schools.

Question IIA

Question IIA asked, "To your knowledge what trends have occured in your department within the last two years in terms of skill vs. theory orientation? In terms of other above areas? . . . . Five years? . . ... Ten years?"

In the two year trend 31 departments, or.575% of the sample said they were in a theory orientation or moving toward such orientation. In the five year trend 27 departments or 50% of the sample made such a statement and in the ten year trend 11 departments or .204% made such a claim.

Question IIB

Question IIB asked, "What instructional needs (hiring for specific qualifications) do you have that reflect trends toward or away from content areas or teaching methods?

Thirty-four departments cited needs for specialized personnel in such areas as communication theory, organizational communication, interpersonal communication, research orientation, behavioral studies, empirical studies and small group communication. These represent 63% of the respondents.

Questions IIIA

Question IIIA asked, "What has been the trend regarding your professional radio-tv offerings? diminishing_____ maintaining_____ expanding_____."

Twenty-two departments reported they were expanding offerings. This is 41% of those reporting.

Question IIB

Question IIB asked, "What has been the trend concerning your survey radio-tv offerings? diminishing_____ maintaining _____ expanding_____."

Interestingly an equal number of departments, 21 reported they were expanding offerings. They represent 39% of the sample.

Question IV

Question IV was a complex question generating some several hundred bits of information; because of this reporting will be general.

The question was, "Which of your skills-oriented courses have emphases that can be most clearly characterized by the following pedagogical philosophies (use number from I above)?"

The pedagogical philosophies were listed as "Core Materials Approach OR Need Assessment Approach; Prescriptive Approach OR Descriptive Approach; and Internal Focus Approach OR External Focus Approach."

This question was answered by 36 departments which was .665% of the sample. They cited the Core Materials Approach over the Need Assessment Approach 101 courses to 57 courses.

The choice of Prescriptive-Descriptive and Internal-External was approximately a 1:1 ratio for each.

Question V

Question V said, "What instructional materials (computer usage, video tape recording, development of films, etc.) are being used this year in your department?"

Many of the responses to this query were minimal, but this may have been due to a typo on the questionnaire where space for response was limited.

However one very significant response occured, and that was in relation to video tape recorders: 36 departments reported moderate to extensive use of the VTR in the classroom. This was .665% of the sample.

Question VI

Question VI inquired, "Do you have any type of undergraduate participation in departmental or school decision making? (Indicate 1. nature, 2. extent of usage, and 3. how selected.)"

Sixty-five per cent of the responding schools (34) reported that the students are involved in decision making ranging from department to (occasionally) the university.

One gentleman in the midwest reported, "No!--if they had anything to say they'd be teaching the course, not taking it!"

Question VII

Question VII asked, "Has there been any trend in methods of grading in your department or school recently? e.g., Pass-No Pass or dropping W or F from record."

This is one of the largest response statistics in the survey--.795% of the departments report the trend of Pass-No Pass or some similar type of grade option. This was 43 of the 54 schools.

Question VIII

The last question asked, "Has your department received budget cuts recently in staff, faculty, or TA's that will ultimately affect your undergraduate program?"

In response to this final question 22 institutions said "yes they were receiving cuts;" 32 schools said "no they were not being cut;" and 7 respondents said they had received increases.

	Question VIII	Per Cent of Sample
Yes	22	40%
No	32	59%
Increase	7	13%

Conclusion

These data will be analyzed and reported in relation to regional trends in a later report.

SPEECH COMMUNICATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Arthur C. Meyer

A four-page questionnaire was sent to all public, comprehensive, community colleges with enrollments of 2,000 or more, to gather normative data on speech programs in community colleges. Of 327 colleges that met the criteria, 175 colleges, or slightly more than 53%, returned usable responses. These 175 responses included 59% (104) from colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 students, and 41% (71) from colleges with 5,000 or more students.

The regional distribution of responses included 27% (48) from Central States, 20% (36) from Eastern States, 15% (26) from Southern States, and 37% (65) from Western States. These responses provided the basic data for this report. In addition to the normative data presented in this study, the data were treated in the variables of two size groups of colleges, and four different regions of the country. The chi-square test was used to assess statistically significant differences among the variables. This report covers five areas of community college speech programs: organizational information, speech program chairman, staff, courses, and activities.

Summary

Organization Information

Approximately one-half of the community colleges included in this survey had departments specifically for the speech program. The departments were located in a division of the college, in which one or more other departments were also located. The most frequently reported titles for the department in which the speech program was located were Speech Department and Speech-Drama Department. These titles accounted for more than one-third of the speech program departments in all of the responding colleges. Approximately two-thirds of the responding colleges reported speech and theatre courses were offered in the same department, and approximately two-thirds of the respondents supported the statement that the speech program in a community college should be treated as a single, separate department.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported departments specifically for the speech program.
2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported use of department titles of Speech Department or Speech-Drama Department.
3. Central and Southern States reported higher percentages than Eastern and Western States of colleges in which speech and theatre courses were offered in the same department.

Role and Responsibilities of the Speech Program Chairman

Approximately one-half of the chairmen of the speech programs were recognized officially with the title of Department Chairman. Two-thirds of the colleges provided a reduced teaching load for the department chairman, and one-half of the colleges reported the reduction was either 20% or 40% of a normal load. Almost all speech programs chairmen were responsible for planning and administering the budget, scheduling classes, and recruiting new faculty. More than one-half of the chairmen evaluated staff and made recommendations for promotion, and approximately three-fourths of the chairmen were assisted by other staff members in evaluation processes.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported that the official title of Department Chairman was used to recognize the speech program chairman.

2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported that the chairman was responsible to plan and administer the budget.
3. Eastern and Central States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of colleges in which the chairman was responsible to evaluate and recommend instructors for promotion and salary increase.

Staff

More than three-fourths of the responding colleges reported the normal teaching load for speech program staff was fifteen hours. Two-thirds of the responding colleges provided compensation for out-of-class responsibilities, either in the form of a reduction in teaching load or additional income.

Approximately one-half of the speech program staff reported by the respondents held the Master's as their highest degree, and an additional one-third had completed thirty graduate hours past the Master's Degree. One in ten of the speech program staff held the Ph.D. degree. One in three of the staff was currently enrolled in a graduate program, and in three-fourths of the reported cases, the graduate program was the Ph.D.

Almost all staff members taught the basic speech course as part of their load. More than one-third of the staff held membership in the Speech Communication Association. The expected additions to staff for the next five years were predicted to be gradual, with a five year total of 315 additional staff members reported by the respondents. Slightly less than two-thirds of the respondents supported the suggestion that graduate schools should develop programs that give special emphasis to the preparation of teachers who will work in speech programs in community colleges.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. Although all regions reported 15 hours as the normal staff load in most cases, Central and Eastern States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of colleges in which 12 hours was the normal load.
2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported that staff were compensated for out-of-class responsibilities.
3. Central and Southern States reported higher percentages than Western States for colleges that provided compensation for staff for out-of-class responsibilities.
4. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges that used reduction in teaching load as the method of compensation for out-of-class responsibilities.
5. Western States reported a lower percentage of staff members who held Ph.D. degrees.
6. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported higher percentages of the use of part time staff than colleges in the 5,000 or more group.
7. Central and Eastern States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of staff members enrolled in graduate programs.
8. A higher percentage of colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported the basic speech course as part of the teaching load for the staff.
9. Southern and Western States reported higher percentages than Central and Eastern States of memberships in Phi Rho Pi.
10. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported higher percentages of memberships in the Speech Communication Association.
11. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of memberships in the Speech Communication Association than the other regions.

Courses

The average number of sections of the basic speech course for all responding colleges was 12, and the average class size was reported equally as 25-29 or 20-24 by most of the colleges. One-third of the colleges reported Communication was the area of emphasis in the basic speech course, and one-fourth of the colleges reported that a departmental syllabus was used for the basic speech course, and more than half of the colleges also reported that students were given a written statement of objectives for the basic speech course. Approximately nine out of ten students in speech program courses were enrolled in speech courses, and one in ten was enrolled in a theatre course. Approximately nine out of ten responding colleges reported that students could take speech programs that were approximately the same as those offered in the first two years of four-year institutions in the area. Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported their speech programs did not include any courses other than the university parallel courses.

More than one-third of the colleges reported students could take a major in speech or drama. The average number of semester credit hours in the speech program for all responding colleges was 23.1. The average number of different courses was 9. More than half of the responding colleges reported that theatre courses were included in the speech program.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. Eastern States reported a higher percentage of colleges that emphasized Public Speaking in the basic speech course than the other regions.
2. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges that used a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course than the other regions.
3. A higher percentage of colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported giving students a written statement of objectives for the basic speech course.
4. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offer courses other than the university parallel courses as part of the speech program.
5. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered a speech major.
6. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the speech program included a drama major.
7. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a drama major than the other regions.
8. Central States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a basic course in theatre as part of the speech program.
9. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a basic course in theatre every semester or quarter.

Activities

Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported a schedule of theatre productions as part of the speech program. The average number of theatre productions reported was 3.2. Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported students can earn college credit for participation in theatre productions, and more than half of the colleges reported the use of a permanent theatre building for productions.

More than half of the responding colleges reported intercollegiate forensic activities as part of the speech program, and more than half of the colleges also reported that students can earn college credit for participation in forensic activities. Two-thirds of the responding colleges reported that 20% or more of staff time was used for activities, and almost two-thirds of the colleges considered this staff time as part of the normal load for instructors.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant

differences:

1. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges with a schedule of theatre production as part of the speech program than the other regions.
2. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered credit for participation in theatre productions.
3. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the use of a permanent theatre building for productions.
4. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported intercollegiate forensic activities as part of the speech program.
5. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of colleges with intercollegiate forensic activities than the other regions.
6. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered credit for student participation in forensic activities.
7. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges in which no staff time was used for non-student credit hour activities than the other regions.

Conclusion

Speech programs are apparently either developed, or in the process of being developed, in community colleges in all parts of the country. Since approximately half of the colleges reported speech departments one might speculate that the trend is toward the organization of separate speech departments in community colleges. Almost all speech program staff members in the community college teach the basic speech course in addition to other responsibilities. Community college speech staff apparently carry a greater responsibility to teach the basic speech course than their colleagues in 4-year institutions. A large number of the community college staff have completed graduate work beyond the Master's degree, which suggests a tendency toward higher educational standards for the community college staff in speech.

The area of speech program courses reveals what might be the greatest strength and the greatest weakness in the current status of community college speech programs. The strength is that students can find approximately the same courses in the community college they would find in the first two years of a four year institution. The weakness is that very few community college speech programs offer any courses other than the university parallel, or transfer, courses. The heterogeneous enrollment in community colleges requires more speech education options for the students. Western States' community colleges, in many ways the leaders of the community college movement, reported a large number of colleges providing speech education opportunities other than the university parallel courses. If the Western States' influence in this area reaches the other regions of the country, it would mark the beginning of a trend to make the speech program in the community college as comprehensive as the community college itself is attempting to be.

PART II

SEMINAR ADDRESSES

The ADASC came into being after a careful study of the need for such a new organization and after an analysis of existing organizations in other professions. Once the need was attested to by hundreds of department administrators, the organizational plan had to be developed. When assistance was sought, it came chiefly from Michael F. Shugrue of the Association of Departments of English. To help tie together the study areas of the Seminar, Dr. Shugrue gave the keynote address on "Departmental Organization and Curriculum Change." The speech presents a challenge to the profession. Further challenges were offered by Robert N. Hall in his speech, "Professional Accountability." Both speakers offered suggestions for future areas of study.

DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

Michael F. Shugrue

Ten years ago in Illinois another group of about this size met to discuss the state of the English profession, needed research in the teaching and learning of English, and the establishment of an association of departments of English.[1] The federally funded Allerton Park Conference called for English professors to "come to grips sincerely and realistically with the uses of literature and the relationship between literary study and the teaching of literacy" (p.21). Moreover, it reminded English departments that "sociology, anthropology, history, the biological sciences, and even the physical sciences have implications for literary analysis and for the teaching of literature" (p. 75).

Much water has washed over the dam in the nearly ten years of ADE's existence. The Association has grown, flourished, and come to be accepted as a responsible professional voice in English representing more than 1,000 two-and four-year college and university departments.[2] And yet the accumulated weight of student protests, cries for relevance, calls for accountability, budgetary strictures, and public disenchantment with higher education have forced English departments--to consider once again who, what, why, and how they teach.

Three recent quotations seem to me to sum up the current state of our professions and to offer directions for the next ten years being explored by ADE. Don Cameron Allen expresses a long-shared and, I am sure, deeply felt conviction about the value of the study of literature when he writes, "The eventual purpose of the study of modern literature, in fact, of all the humanities, is to celebrate the continuity of the mind, to permit the modern reader to find his place in the history of consciousness, to alleviate his sense of loneliness by enabling him to see himself in the vocal past and image himself in the silent future, and to make him at the same time proud of his humanity but humble in his pride."[3] Some colleagues, appalled by the mindlessness and self-indulgence of many students and disheartened by the admission of so-called unqualified students into college-level programs and by the introduction of social and political issues into college and university life, would turn to Professor Allen's words with comfort. He eloquently defends the great tradition, not for its own sake, but because an awareness of and an involvement with that tradition makes us more human and helps us to fulfill our potential as human beings. Other colleagues, equally committed to engaging a growing number of students of differing backgrounds and abilities in the life of the college or university, can find in his words reassurance that the text, the lesson, the course exists not in and for itself but as a vehicle for self-discovery, for growing power with language, and for a better and stronger imaginative capacity.

Even as the English community hearkens to Allen's defense of literature in modern education--and in society--, it is accutely aware of Douglas M. Knight's warning that ". . . our waning century poses the same major problems . . . for the student and the citizen, for the professionally trained mind and the thoughtfully committed one, for the graduate school and for society at large. The demand on us is that of discovery and new conviction in a world we no longer understand. We are baffled by the frustration of more knowledge than we can master, by the obscurity of its effect on us,by the paradoxes of want and plenty, security and violence, high capability and limited performance. And our efforts at discovery move us to one conclusion. The community of scholars cannot unthinkingly sustain itself, nor will past honor sustain it. Instead it must come to full integrity again, not by pandering to the trivial demands of our time but by striking at our deepest human needs."[4] Again, some will argue that full integrity demands full intellectual rigor, the maintenance of standards against external forces, the preservation of intellectual freedom and intellectual curiosity. They will maintain that the academicians serve the present best by serving it least, that the pursuit of

truth without regard for passing social change is the most honorable path for the scholar-teacher to follow. Others will find Knight's haunting words a plea for academicians to find new ways to reach and move a desperately stuuggling people in need of intellectual, aesthetic, and personal direction. Knight's call for full integrity, they will argue, demands reaching out to many students and adults who would ordinarily never have the opportunity to enter college. It asks the scholar and teacher to participate in the life of his society, to help make that life rich and satisfying. It asks the scholar and teacher to question the value of the teaching and research he undertakes.

Maynard Mack, in his eloquent MLA Presidential Address in 1970, urging the English profession to "reach out to the disadvantaged," "to the general community of educated men and women," "to the media," and "to each other," confirms our need to enrich our own disciplines by drawing upon the riches of other disciplines: "We must . . . encourage our students to reach out by initiating programs that enable them to do so, programs more intensive, probably more protracted, and certainly more liberal than the usual two years of course work, which will carry them toward literature and sociology, literature and anthropology, literature and psychology, literature and the other arts, or any one of a number of other fruitful combinations, including learning theory, thus making them not only better teachers but more perceptive and more comprehensive human beings."[5]

Professor Mack's statement, unlike those by Allen and Knight, does not admit of equally satisfying but opposing interpretations. It does not ask every scholar and teacher to reach out to all of the same audiences, but it does remind professions that they must reach out in such a way that our larger society feels the helping hand that we extend, the hand that leads to literacy, that leads to power with language, that leads to deeply satisfying imaginative experiences, that leads to an increasing understanding of our common humanity in a complex twentieth century world.

Mack elegantly outlines, too, our responsibility in English to reach out to other disciplines, to share with them, to grow with them, to build programs which engage and expand the minds of our students. It is to that task that ADE set itself during the past academic year. We have begun to work with chairmen in Speech, History, Theatre Arts, the Foreign Languages, Philosophy, Geography, and even Geology to explore common interests. We have through CONPASS and the projects which it generated among the disciplines begun to identify and to share ideas about the possibilities and limitations of substantive interdisciplinary programs. Indeed, one important resolution of the recent San Francisco ADE Seminar on the Development of Interdisciplinary Study calls for "English chairmen to take the initiative on their respective campuses to establish committees consisting of representatives from foreign languages, linguistics, speech, theatre, communications, and comparative literature for the purpose of strengthening and improving the teaching of language and literature and reassessing the role of language and literature in the institutional curriculum."

Our new conferences and programs, especially in the last two years, have marked new steps for ADE, a new willingness to question not only traditional ways of organizing and talking about knowledge and human experience but traditional degree structures, departmental organizations, and relationships between departments and the schools, the community, and the public at large. It will never, of course, be easy to resolve all of the intellectual, pedagogical, and administrative impediments to genuine interdisciplinary work. Recruiting, staffing, budgeting, and promoting pose formidable barriers for many chairmen eager to introduce courses and programs which bring English and speech or history or anthropology together.

The models which ADE has examined, the theories which we have explored and modified, the trends which we have identified here in the United States and

abroad, however, should help departments interested in interdisciplinary work to defend their interest, to defend its intellectual and pedagogical bases and rigor, to defend the administrative adjustments necessary to staff and operate new, responsive courses and programs in the 1970's.

We can come together, then, as a community of scholars engaged in joint inquiry into the curriculum of the 1970's, concerned about excellence in teacher education, and committed to effective teaching in the schools and on college campuses.

Together, chairmen in English and speech-communications departments can begin the revitalization of the undergraduate curriculum, the enrichment of the college communications program, the restoration of some sense of wholeness to undergraduate education, and the reponsiveness of college teaching and learning to the enormous social, educational, and cultural needs of our society.

The principal workshop report of the June 1972 ADE Seminar emphasizes the importance of interdepartmental, interdisciplinary work in language and literature:

> The development and implementation of effective interdisciplinary programs involving imaginative literature and language is a matter of urgent priority for the nation's college and university language and literature departments.
>
> We in ADE recognize and value a variety of interdisciplinary forms, while at the same time believing with some passion that mere patchings-together of existing disciplines--mere collections of "various points of view" without purposeful interaction among them--is no advance over the past. We are convinced that success in reinvigorating awareness of the uses of imaginative power can be achieved by work shaped by a governing concept, by interdisciplinary work that is thematically ordered, and by work which may be called situational and aims at the reconstruction of human experience from the perspective of its innerness.
>
> We are in agreement, further, that success <u>cannot</u> be achieved except if the interdisciplinary ventures are understood from the start as requiring transformations of structure, significant realignments of relations between teachers and students, administration and faculty, college and community. Commitment by the student to a view of himself as passive "recipient" . . . commitment by administrations to inflexible modes of assessing teaching loads . . . self-conceptions by teachers that imply all-knowingness or the notion that the act of teaching doesn't necessitate <u>continual</u> self-transformation--all these are major obstacles to effective work of the sort vital now.

ADE's concerns,like yours, reflect a growing interest in cooperative teaching. We extend our hand to your new Association to aid and to be aided in our common search for a revitalized undergraduate and graduate curriculum and for research which speaks as fully to American society at large as to the individual academic specialist.

Footnotes

1. See The Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1963.

2. The wide range of ADE surveys, studies, and programs is apparent to any reader of the quarterly ADE Bulletin.

3. "The Graduate Study of Modern Literature," The Graduate Journal (1971), p. 433.

4. "Knowledge as a Center of Conflict," The Graduate Journal (1971), p. 399.

5. "To See It Feelingly," PMLA (May 1971), p. 372.

PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Robert N. Hall

A professional association, whether it be the Speech Communication Association or the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication, has three functions which it must fulfill. The first is a scholarly function, the second is a professional function, and the third is a political function. The scholarly function is best dealt with by those most active in the scholarship. Taking the liberty, however, to make a comment on research in the field, it may be that our research is not only misdirected and misguided, but very probably even useless not only to ourselves, but to people outside the profession. It appears to me that professionally something needs to be done about the "what" and "how" of the research if we are to succeed as a profession. Too often, speech is rated low on the accountability scale by college and university administrators. Solid, meaningful research could help strengthen our position in the academic world.

It is accountability on the professional level, however, where I wish to place the main emphasis. Professionally, as an Association, we have certain obligations we need to fulfill. I use the word "obligation,"rather than "accountability" since any association is probably judged by its members on the degree of a fulfilled obligation. Obviously, the fulfillment of the obligation is a very individualized concept for each member. After seven years with the SCA, I have ascertained that the following are some of our accountable obligations:

We have an obligation to our graduate students both on a departmental level and an Association level. We bring more and more students into our programs, we graduate more and more students, we have more and more graduate programs being instituted in colleges across the country, and we have fewer and fewer jobs for them on the acaemic level, and we have virtually no jobs for them on the non-academic level.

We have a placement service within the SCA which attempts to serve the graduate students to the degree that it can; but it is thwarted by many departments in the profession which refuse to use the Placement Service. Many departments prefer to use individualized, non-competitive methods for filling existing vacancies. Some departments, particularly the large departments, prefer to use the non-competitive method of finding their faculty rather than opening the search to find the best qualified person in the field. I think the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will soon put an end to that type of faculty recruitment when the "Affirmative Action" plan is fully implemented. In August, the Association had 400 to 500 people who indicated they were unemployed. There probably were 300 to 400 positions throughout the country for which these persons were qualified. Until such time as the Association can obtain full support from all departmental administrators in the field, we can never fully meet the obligation to the young, emerging professional.

We have an obligation to the women within the profession. As far as employment opportunities within the speech communication arts and sciences are concerned, we are meeting that obligation. Within the Association our membership is approximately seventy percent male, thirty percent female. Of those persons who indicated they were unemployed, seventy-two percent were male, twenty-eight percent were female. As far as rank and salary are concerned, that, of course, is a departmental concern of which the SCA has no real knowledge.

We have an obligation and, therefore, an accountability to ethnic minorities. Within the Placement Service, for example, we have no blacks, we have four Chicanos, and five American Indians. This would seem to indicate that we have never tried to recruit these people into the profession. The Association primarily depends on individuals and on departments for names of potential members. It is, thus, the departments that are going to have to do the work. If the departments are to actively seek minority students, they may want and should receive support from ADASC. Both this Association and departments should mount a wide-spread campaign aimed at explaining the benefits to the minority person who majors in speech communication. The burden is on us.

We have, in the 58 year existence of the Speech Communication Association, given lip service to teachers in elementary and secondary education and on the community college level, and that is all we have ever given them -- lip service. We have never attempted to recruit elementary and secondary teachers; we have made feeble attempts at recruiting in community colleges, but basically we have ignored them. Neither of these groups has ever truly been represented in the Association. The few members we do have at the elementary-secondary-community college level are seldom asked to serve the Association. When it comes to appointing them to committees, they are consistently passed over. The comments for not appointing members of these groups usually go like this: "Well, I don't know them," or "Have they ever done anything?" or "What can they do?" or "They can't get money from their school to attend meetings." Several years ago, a recommendation was made to the SCA Nominating Committee to consider a secondary teacher for nomination to the presidency. The Committee easily decided that there was not an elementary or secondary teacher in the country who (1) could be president of SCA and (2) who could get the financial backing from their school. Maybe those assumptions are true, but no one ever tried to test their validity. The same attitude is held concerning our community college members. If this Association truly wants to serve elementary, secondary, and community college teachers, then a strenuous effort must be made to recruit those persons and to utilize their services once they join. To do otherwise is to have a zero accountability and to admit failure in our obligation. The SCA established a Committee on Speech-Theatre in the community College. If that Committee receives wide SCA support, it may succeed in its task. If it succeeds, then our burden is lessened. But the ADASC should not wait for another association to act; we should move on our own!

Another area where we have an obligation and real accountability is on the graduate program level, because that is where most of our problems will come from in the profession. There have been attempts within the SCA to get a moratorium on all new degree programs in the speech profession. There should be support for such a moratorium since current economic conditions point to a growing crisis in the job market. There are a good number of departments that want to establish new master's programs. Those departments see such programs as one way to enhance their status within the profession and within their own college. That enhancing factor is recognized, but not justified in view of the job market. There are departments that want to institute doctoral programs, undoubtedly for the same reasons as those departments that want new master's programs. Justification, however, is difficult. The profession is now attempting to determine whether or not a doctor of arts degree ought to be instituted in speech. This degree has its proponents and its opponents. The proponents see it as one way to get teaching back into the classroom. The opponents see it as another unproven degree that will only glut the job market further. Perhaps in five or ten years, if the economy changes, if cost accountability proves itself, if the accountability to the public, to the institutions and to the legislatures justify our existence, then there is time for new degree programs.

Placing a moratorium on new degree programs does not mean there should not be new area programs within existing graduate departments. We have been remiss as a profession and as an Association in not having programs in speech for the disadvantaged, in pre-adolescent speech, or in speech development. Those types of programs ought to be part of our graduate curriculum since they are justifiable. The alternative to a moratorium on new programs is to limit enrollment. Obviously, a moratorium would be far less controversial than a limitation on enrollment.

We also have an obligation to undergraduates. The SCA does have a student membership category; most of the membership in that category results from coercion from the speech methods teacher. Probably eighty percent of such members do not renew. Perhaps they will rejoin later when they go on to graduate school. But SCA records make it difficult to tell. The majority of the undergraduate students drop their membership because (1) they see no access to working in the Association, and

(2) they see little to be gained through membership, except receipt of a journal. It would be helpful to the ADASC if it did utilize, if it did listen, and if it did offer some services to students.

A political function is now a part of virtually every association. The SCA was politically motivated in 1968 when it voted to move its 1970 convention from Chicago. The SCA created almost the same kind of chaos the Democrats had. Hundreds of the members said "If the SCA moves its convention from Chicago, I will drop my membership" and hundreds more said "If the SCA does not move its convention, I will drop my membership." What finally resulted was a general consensus within SCA that the Association probably ought not to get involved in political matters. But how can a speech association avoid it? The SCA Commission on Freedom of Speech, which has as one charge to protest violations of free speech as guaranteed under the First Amendment to the Constitution, has to be political. If the SCA or the ADASC are to be truly national organizations, then they ought to act in all cases where freedom of speech is threatened. If there is national action, then we are fulfilling a political function. If we choose to respond only to threats to academicians, then we greatly limit our scope. A limitation in scope can only lead to a limitation in the respect we can expect from the academic and non-academic world alike.

As professionals in speech, we ought to be concerned with community-related affairs. We ought to have our curriculum oriented toward training people to exist in a real world. Community-oriented programs would help. One reason for the current emphasis on accountability is that state legislators and people in general do not really understand what education is about these days. If we had been concerned with communication in its broadest sense, rather than with the training of researchers, we might not have found it necessary to spend these hours discussing our accountability problem.

We are a young profession within the academic structure, and, as such, we have not had a great amount of time to solve our professional problems. But if we are to grow, both as a profession and as Associations, then we must begin to fulfill all of our obligations or we will self-destruct.

PART III

HIGHER EDUCATION AND UNIONIZATION

In spite of the assumption that most faculty members consider themselves "professionals" and, therefore, not truly qualified for union membership, the unionization of college and university faculties appears to be part of the wave of the future or, perhaps, the present. To acquaint administrators with the organizations chiefly concerned with becoming bargaining agents, the ADASC invited representatives from the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors to present their case at the Seminar. Three administrators were invited to respond.

What happens when unionization takes place was graphically demonstrated as this session of the Seminar began. Because the International Union of Elevator Constructors was picketing outside the Palmer House (they were not picketing the Palmer House, however), the AFT and the NEA representatives, refusing to cross any picket line, did not appear. Both submitted a one-page statement explaining why they were not at the session. Those statements begin this section of the BULLETIN.

The three administrators, having nothing to respond to, prepared their papers on the basis of research and practical experience. Anita Taylor, realizing that unionization is inevitable, asks the question, how will it come about? L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite discusses the impact that collective bargaining will have on colleges and universities. A case study of unionization and the City University of New York is presented by James E. Roever.

All three present many ideas and problems which eventually will have to be considered by administrators at all levels of the academic spectrum.

SEATTLE
COMMUNITY
COLLEGE

FEDERATION
OF TEACHERS
AFT

823 East Denny Way
Seattle, Wa. 98122
(206) 324-9385

JOHN A. BARTON
PRESIDENT

DONALD JANUS
EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT

GEORGE GOLDEN
VICE-PRESIDENT
BUSINESS AND COMMERCE

FRANK ROBERTS
VICE-PRESIDENT
COMMUNITY SERVICE

LILIANE GILBERT
VICE-PRESIDENT
LIBERAL STUDIES

ROBERT WILSON
VICE-PRESIDENT
TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL

HAROLD TOLFORD
VICE-PRESIDENT
SOUTH SEATTLE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DALE MEYER
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

LUCILLE CHARNLEY
RECORDING SECRETARY

ZAKI M. EL WATTAR
TREASURER

LLOYD A. FRISSELL
PAST PRESIDENT

Democracy in Education

Education for Democracy

AFT
AFL-CIO

SCCFT

July 6, 1972

Dr. Ernest E. Ettlich, Chairman
Department of Speech
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99163

Dear Dr. Ettlich:

This is to inform you that I as the AFT representative will not be able to address the First Annual Seminar of the Association of Department and Administrators in Speech Communication by virtue of the fact that the Palmer House is being picketed by an authorized strike by the Local #2 of the International Union of Elevator Constructors.

We will be happy to provide you with a written statement on the AFT position on Collective Bargaining, Faculty Organization, and the Departmental Administrator: The Organization View to be included in your proceedings.

We are sorry about this consequence since it was to some expense that I made the trip to Chicago to address the group.

It is the position of the AFT to honor the efforts of any organized labor in their attempt to secure fair, equitable and honorable working conditions and we expect our brothers in labor to do likewise when we in education are forced to resort to this avenue for redress.

Sincerely,

John A. Barton

John A. Barton

em

cc: David Selden, President, AFT
Charles Ruzkowski, Business Manager
Local 2, International Union of Elevator Constructors

STATEMENT OF
EDWARD F. BONTEMPO, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATE
NEA DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Recognizing some obvious distinctions between college faculty and elevator construction workers, I nevertheless recognize some not so obvious similarities.

I have chosen not to cross the picket line of the International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 2, for the following reasons:

As a union organizer I have an obligation to honor the just cause of other unions.

The forces which impelled the elevator construction workers to strike are identical to those which are causing increasing numbers of college faculty to organize.

To cross a picket line in order to discuss unionization is an irony best left to fiction.

Despite the fear of many academics that they will be forced into strikes (an unfounded fear) to support other unions, the fact remains that the best friends of college faculty--as of all teachers--are the working men and women who entrust the education of their children to you, who support, through a taxation almost impossibly regressive, that education, and who so often aspire for their children the respect shown college faculty.

I realize that your planning could not account for a strike about which you knew nothing. Nevertheless, I urge you to seek out the cause of the strike and to support the strikers.

THE RELEVANT QUESTION, HOW?

Anita Taylor

It is an interesting position to speak in reaction to people who are not present, but I shall not react to their absence. It is also interesting to see my name on this program described as it is (Collective Bargaining, Faculty Organization, and the Departmental Administrator: The Administrator's View) since I have just completed a year as President of the Faculty Association of the St. Louis community colleges. In the St. Louis district, the Faculty Association is really kind of a company union; and I use that description in both its favorable and unfavorable senses. But I also chair a small department and thus have some relevant observations, though my company union differs considerably from a national organization.

I will observe at the outset that the question is not IF unionization occurs. It is not even WHEN unionization may occur, although for many of you it may seem very remote. And its not whether we like it or not. I personally, as a faculty member, do not think I do. But that is not the issue. No, from the department administrator's point of view, the only relevant question is HOW. How shall unionism happen to us? How shall we as administrators of departments deal with faculty unionization is the only question I believe to be relevant--because unionism will occur whether we like it or not. For some of us it has already occurred; for others it will occur soon; and for most of us it will occur within our lifetime--our active professional lifetime.

Answering the relevant question determines the plan of this presentation. I intend to identify some of the events that will result from unionization, comment on how those events may affect the role of department chairmen, and make an observation regarding how I think we ought to attempt to influence those events.

So how will it happen? What will unionization mean? For some of us it will bring drastic changes, and for others not very much change will occur because the structures that will be created by unionization already exist in some institutions.

One of the first results of collective bargaining by faculties will be salary schedules which specify equal pay for equal rank and seniority. Furthermore, conditions for advancement in rank and salary will be clearly delineated. Awarding of "merit" increments, which may still be done if a faculty chooses to bargain for such benefits, will be according to collectively defined prescriptions for distribution. This type of salary schedule and advancement for faculty now exists in some institutions. For them and for chairmen in those schools, the role of department chairmen in implementing the schedule will change little. For others, clear salary schedules with clear conditions for placement thereon will bring drastic changes in the chairman's role.

Second, collective faculty decisions will play a major role in promotion and retention of staff. In hiring, department administrators may have a freer hand than in some schools where now tenured faculty control the hiring. That depends on the specific agreements reached. But for retention, non-promotion, or non-renewal of appointments the conditions will be clearer, defined in a collective sense, and the department chairman will be much more restricted than now. The popular belief that faculty cannot be dismissed under a collective agreement is a myth. But doubtless the procedures for dismissal or non-promotion will be more detailed and use of those procedures will be enforced. Critical to the department chairman's influence in these decisions will be his position relative to the bargaining unit. I have an observation about that in a minute.

Third, conditions of employment will be more clearly prescribed in a collective bargaining agreement than they are now for most of us. The terms of employment, the hours, working conditions, activities to be engaged in, etc., will be specified, probably on an institution-wide basis. Job descriptions that are more than generalities will be written, both for teachers and administrators. For most

of us that will cause vast changes in our working relationships with members of our departments.

Finally, this matter of relationships will be the most critical of the changes wrought by unionization. Because of the changes described above, department administrators' relationships with faculty can be drastically altered--improved or impeded--depending on our position in the bargaining unit. With establishment of a union in your institution, will you be within the bargaining unit or outside it? That is THE critical question, critical in the sense that if department chairmen are not included in the bargaining union, we have an entirely different ball game with totally different rules. If we are not within the bargaining unit, we become "management" in the sense that unions and union members perceive management: outsiders, adversaries, the natural enemies of the "faculty." We must avoid that role, and the only way I see to avoid it is to influence the initial organization of our institutions. We must establish bargaining units that consider department chairmen to be faculty. Personally, you may not want to become a union member. But remember the consequences for your department if you do not. I think the choice is clear.

One concluding comment I want to make is that we should prepare now so that we may influence the HOW of unionism when it happens. Education goal setting, on the departmental level as well as the institutional, needs to be done comprehensively and precisely. Moreover, it needs to be done with involvement of the entire institutional community. If students, departments and institution share the same goals, the traumas of unionizing will be considerably less than if these goals differ widely. Sadly, the latter is probably a closer description of the current state of affairs in departments as well as institutions. Thus we are presented with a real leadership challenge--and the task is urgent. We must quit wasting our time worrying about IF and WHEN unionization, and put our house in order now, so that when it occurs the HOW will be one we can live with.

THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite

As we contemplate the many and diverse problems facing higher education, traditional university government based upon what Harold Hodgkinson has described as "two parts trust, one part loyalty, two parts self-sacrifice, one part leadership" is giving way to government by collective negotiation born of distrust and dedicated to the proposition that shared leadership has failed and must be replaced by the bargaining table--not a roundtable but one which finds the constituent parts of the university community in adversary roles.

My assignment, as I understand it, is to assess the impact of collective bargaining upon university organization and governance. To do so I must rely on what we glean from limited experiences of institutions where collective negotiation is now a way of life and upon assessments made by other administrators whose knowledge and grasp of what is involved is far greater than mine. Since I accepted the invitation to undertake this awesome task, I have spent many hours combing the literature, which I find replete with information on collective bargaining in the public schools but little on higher education, where it is a relatively recent phenomenon. And I have run up some sizeable phone bills "bugging" former colleagues and professional acquaintances who have first hand experience with collective bargaining on their respective campuses.

If I were to advance a thesis for my assessments and observations, it would be that collective bargaining promises, for better or worse, to revolutionize university organization and governance as we have known it. And, as I see it, that revolution will affect every level and segment of the campus community from the board of trustees and the president down to the lowliest custodian.

Having "stuck my neck out" in such categorical fashion, I'm duty bound to explain the bases for such an assessment. First some observations concerning outcomes and potential outcomes of collective bargaining as these outcomes bear on governance:

Agreements being forged at the bargaining table represent changes which would seem to provide certain benefits for faculty and professional staff who constitute one party to the agreement. Primary among these changes are an increase in the potential for a voice in the decision-making authority on their campuses, for stronger grievance procedures, and for the support of a legally binding base concerning matters both substantive and procedural. Once a bargaining unit gains recognition and then a contract, both parties must adhere to its provisions, subject of course to interpretation by external agencies such as employee relations boards and the courts. During the period of the contract faculty members and other professionals apparently find themselves far less vulnerable to caprice and board policies such as those resulting from changes in leadership in boards of trustees or regents. Another alleged advantage is that matters agreed upon at the bargaining table take precedence over trustee policies and even over state and local regulations except, of course, those which are statutory. With the growing tendency for state public employee relations boards to take a broad view of what may be negotiated, the way appears to be open for a union to gain a much greater influence over policy-making in higher education generally and over the procedures for arriving at those policies. Ultimately negotiated contracts may affect not only personnel considerations but conceivably decisions on the role and mission of the institution itself, since these may be deemed as having a very real effect upon "terms and conditions of employment."

Another major change is a potential shift in the bases for job security--deriving from the greivance process spelled out in all contracts, a process by which

formal, monitored procedures provide for appeals from administrative decisions, especially those related to terms of employment, tenure, and promotion. In fact, it is not inconceivable that traditional tenure regulations will give way to precise contractual provisions spelling out the nature of and bases for job security based upon seniority and other factors.

But if these changes are to be construed as advantages accruing to the union party to negotiated agreements, the bargaining suggests prospects for advantages and benefits also accruing to management. Grievance procedures, for example, are a two-way street. They afford governing boards a means of establishing clearly and somewhat definitively what constitutes satisfactory professional service, including teaching and research. The state will be able to insist upon a more finite and precise kind of accountability from faculty members, including such perquisites as sabbaticals, teaching load differentials, time and facilities for research, student-faculty ratios, etc., etc., etc. Furthermore it should be possible for management to insist upon definitive criteria for measuring educational productivity in return for improvements in compensation and fringe benefits. In short, I suggest that many aspects of academic life, until now considered matters for strictly professional concern, will be subject to external scrutiny and a negotiated appraisal. In other words, "big brother" in the guise of the state will have an opportunity to specify more explicitly how the professional staff can be held accountable.

It is already demonstrable that where collective bargaining exists, the system of governance becomes more explicit, more uniform, and more centralized. As questions are raised at bargaining tables, matters long left vague must be clarified and defined. For collective negotiation is an adversary process borrowed in conceptual terms from jurisprudence. The process demands trained negotiators, "legalists" in their approach and posture. Negotiators characteristically insist upon clear-cut definitions and understandings that will stand up in court if necessary. One result foreseen by William Boyd, President of Central Michigan University, is an increase in board power at the expense of faculty power. This occurs, says Boyd, because the need for clarity requires a congruence between de jure and de facto power. In the past, college and university governing boards, holders of de jure power, have partly by design and partly by sloth, permitted faculties to achieve de facto power. Ambiguity and a willingness to leave certain questions unraised have provided a vacuum giving rise to faculty power. Boyd concludes that the need for reappraisal brought about by collective negotiation is likely to find faculty power waning.

This legalistic "explicitness" indigenous to collective negotiation has other consequences as well. Joseph Garbarino notes that under collective bargaining personnel policies become more formalized, more uniform, more subject to review and appeal--in short more rigid. After centuries of what some have viewed as near anarchy in university government, the virtues of such uniformity may at first blush seem attractive. Professor Garbarino adds a sobering reflection: "One suspects," he notes, "that in those key institutions in which an untidy, unsystematic process of peer evaluation has worked with demonstrated success, the introduction of procedures that can be defended before an arbitrator, or perhaps a judge, will incur a real cost of quality." Such uniformity, of course, means one rule for all. Granted, this type of uniformity abolishes discrimination, but in doing so I suggest that it threatens discriminating judgments that have in the past permitted some institutions, some departments, some programs to excel while others remained mediocre or worse.

Still another consequence of uniformity and centralization of power required for campus-wide bargaining and contract administration will, in all likelihood, be a diminution of departmental and school autonomy. Recent trends toward decentralization, a necessary concomitant of the rapid growth of the fifties and sixties, are

likely to be halted if not reversed. Departments per se have no representation at the bargaining table. Decisions governing appointments, promotions, tenure, salary increments, etc., are negotiated above and outside departmental jurisdiction. Departmental autonomy, which faculty usually have in mind when they speak of decentralization, may well be an early casualty of collective bargaining.

Earlier we suggested an increase in board power as one by-product of the clarifying legalisms introduced by collective bargaining. In a more direct way also bargaining points ultimately to a resurgence of board control. No matter who actually sits at the bargaining table, the authority of the board dominates one side; the board must ultimately be held legally accountable for the results. What's more, it is becoming increasingly clear that administrators in the persons of presidents, chancellors, provosts and deans become agents of the board responsible for implementation of the provisions of the contract.

But it's not only the increased centralization of power in the local campus board with which we may be concerned. There's yet another development of which we at the lower echelons of administration may be unaware. For actually the local campus board sees its own power and authority being usurped by super boards, regents, state departments, etc. As a matter of fact the trend toward the centralization of power at the state level is, in the opinion of many, one of the most significant developments in the governance of higher education today. Some say this trend is a casual factor in faculty unionism, but it is almost surely a consequence as well.

But you ask, "How is this so?" "What has this trend toward state control to do with collective bargaining on the campus?" Well, let's speculate for a moment. If each public university in a given state were to bargain separately, what economists call "coercive comparison" creates a constant upward spiralling of faculty salaries as the most favored faculty of year one established the base figures for year two. How high will the spiralling go? The stewards of scarce public funds are bound to protect the public coffers with line-item budgeting at a centralized level as a means of sheltering funds against bargaining demands. Salaries will be set at state levels with increments, if any, scheduled in much the same manner as for civil servants today. (This phenomenon lends credence to Garbarino's prediction that collective bargaining is apt to have more impact on salary administration than on salary levels.)

And let us not overlook the likelihood that unions too will be advancing national goals, not necessarily consonant with those of your campus or mine. Hence the growth of the off-campus power centers. In the face of this general trend, there appears to be something more obscene than funny about the fact that back on campus more and more groups are contending for power, hardly noticing that the power is disappearing as they struggle. (A pyrrhic victory looms on the horizon.)

Still another noticeable effect of collective bargaining will be a change in what Boyd refers to as the development of a "management complex." Even without unions, grim economic realities and the new emphasis on accountability are pressing university administrators into management practices once regarded as alien to academe;practices that call for a system of reviews and controls which many faculty find repugnant. Collective bargaining only serves to thrust the administration still further into what closely resembles a corporate management role. Moreover, contract implementation with its emphasis on legalism, its cumbersome grievance procedures and adversary proceedings will almost inevitably change the tone and attitude of university administration. The last remnants of what Boyd calls "colleagueship" will doubtless fade. Personal relationships are at best strained when personnel relations are altered so fundamentally.

Still another impact of collective bargaining on college governance is apt to be at least a temporary setback for the student power movement. Isn't there irony in the prospect that, just as students begin to secure a meaningful role in decision-making on the campus, the site of power should be moved to a bargaining table

at which they aren't even represented? And at which their interests are apt to be the first to be surrended? Some, of course, forsee the rise of student unions as a corrective, but meanwhile student participation in college and university governance appears slated for the sidelines.

Inevitable also is the diminution in the influence and prestige of the "old faculty elite." Not only is the distinguished professor incompatible with the egalitarianism engendered by collective bargaining, but that minority of scholarly-oriented professors who have long constituted the aristocracy of academe cannot but lose prestige and prerogatives under the leveling influence of faculty unions. The principal reason is, of course, that much of the press for unions comes from the marginal members of the faculty who have much to gain and little if anything to lose by any redistribution of power and rewards. Another reason is that faculty senates, the traditional power base of the regular faculty, are destined to atrophy in the wake of collective bargaining.

As the scope of negotiations at the bargaining table widens--and you can be sure it will widen with each new contract period--the authority of a senate must be narrowed correspondingly, or conflicting jurisdictions result. If faculty are permitted to wield power via both a union and a senate, they, in effect, have a double dip. Governing boards are hardly likely to accept such a disadvantaged position.

Experience has shown that the organizational and administrative structure of universities and colleges under collective bargaining becomes modified in still another significant way. Where operative the bargaining process is proving costly in both money and time. Involving what Duryea and Fisk of SUNY in Buffalo call "essentially non-productive effort," it requires a whole new bureaucratic structure to carry on the negotiations, to pursue the grievances, and to meet the requests for consultation and information which the process requires. Dean Stillings of CMU, commenting on the fiscal implications of collective bargaining, ticks off the following: the services of an administrative official, his supportive staff, equipment; extensive legal services, computer time, "paperizing" the bargaining teams, the faculty, the administration; stand-by time of the public relations office; the indirect cost of administrative time of deans, provost, budget director, and what Stillings calls the "overall loss of administrative and teaching productivity." The most time-consuming aspect is of course the on-going implementation of what are proving to be detailed and cumbersome grievance procedures and general record keeping. At CMU and Buffalo this has meant an expansion of the bureaucratic structures of provosts' and deans' offices, and, as you would expect, demands on the part of participants in grievance procedures for released time to perform these onerous duties.

According to Duryea, Fisk, and Stillings, experience with the bargaining process per se at Buffalo & Central Michigan has revealed a problem which threatens the whole underlying rationale of a university. This problem stems from what Duryea and Fisk refer to as a "temptation to take as a model the experience of other private and public bargaining organizations . . ." Noting that the long established and prevalent "industrial model" has become the modus vivendi for collegial bargaining, Stillings sees its literal application as antithetical to the goals of the academic community. He sees the use of the traditional industrial model as running counter to the university community's concept of shared governance. I quote directly from an address by Stillings to the Illinois State University faculty:

"While industry can live with, and accept a concept born out of dissimilar ends, that is, the concept that each of the opposing groups wants to maximize its own interests, the university cannot accept such a concept since both faculty and administration have the same goals. The practices of collective bargaining focus on security, longevity, working conditions, and wages, while the practices of shared governance in a university community involve evaluation, criticism, and judgment within total environs and with the goal of advancing all aspects of the

community."

"Collective bargaining is, almost literally, a "tug-of-war," antithetical on the collegial level scene since one group is pulling against another. The basic mind-set of the industrial model is precisely this pulling against one another. Yet, in some way, this mind-set must be dissipated or averted. The administration wants to give but it must give within the total needs of the university. The faculty "pulls" at the bargaining table to maximize its own well-being. The CMU experience has not provided evidence of the good faith of faculty to concern themselves with the total picture; consequently, the administration may have to assume the role of adversary. We are beginning to wonder whether we will be able to have collective bargaining and a university in which the faculty exercise many of the traditional prerogatives of management. Consider the fact that departments under the shared governance approach determine who is to be appointed, who is to be terminated, who is to get tenure, who is to be promoted, and even what work is to be done. Imagine, if you can, the workers in an automobile plant deciding that they would not build two-door automobiles. Consider, also, faculty participation in the selection of the administration and try to visualize the same as a part of the industrial process. Further, the industrial grievance process is considerably less responsive to the individual than is that of the open forum of the senate since the union requires some visibility to exist as an organization, while the senate places the rights of the individual foremost."

"There is also no question that one of the basic postures of university administration must be to find new ways of doing bargaining to preserve the nature of the university process of decision-making."

We noted earlier that collective bargaining with its campus-wide jurisdiction tends to diminish departmental autonomy. What then of the department chairman? Will we who traditionally identify with the faculty on one hand and the administration on the other be permitted to continue in that dual role? Is there a place for us at the bargaining table? If so, on which side, union or management? Or can we remain neutral?

Precedent to date places the chairman in the ranks of the faculty for bargaining purposes. New York law places all members of the academic community below the president on one side of the negotiation table and the representatives of management on the other. Central Michigan University, now in its third year with collective bargaining and its first year of a three-year contract, draws the line between deans and department chairman, the former being considered management and the latter faculty.

If we departmental executive officers had the opportunity to choose, on which side of the bargaining table do we see ourselves as functioning in a manner consistent with what we regard as our legitimate role?

What of our role and status <u>after</u> the contract becomes effective and implementation is the order of the day? If we elect to line up with the faculty, do we envision ourselves as taking the role of a foreman or of a shop steward carrying faculty grievances to the dean or provost? Or if we view ourselves primarily as administrators, do we divest ourselves of faculty prerogatives and become accountable only to the administration.

Many of us serve at the pleasure of our departmental colleagues, some elected and others appointed by the dean in consultation with a departmental faculty. Some chairmen rotate into and out of their positions on a term basis. Under these circumstances, do we have a choice of which side of the table we occupy?

Frankly, I see us as facing an identity crisis. Frank Stillings tells me that at CMU department chairmen find themselves in an uncomfortably ambivalent set of circumstances: For negotiating purposes they're faculty. But for contract implementation purposes their duties are essentially administrative. Is it any wonder that at CMU the chairmen are seriously considering the possibility of forming an association of their own?

As I've reflected on these ambivalences, I've found myself wondering whether a neutral role for the department chairman--with all of its risks--might not be in the best interests of all concerned. From our perspective as chairmen, motivated by concerns for faculty welfare and institutional well-being, are we not uniquely equipped to provide information and counsel to the representatives of both the union and the management? Can we not serve as a preliminary sounding board for faculty proposals before they are put on the bargaining table? In a similar manner, can't we also advise management before counter-proposals are offered?

During the term of the contract are we not by virtue of our position qualified to check the impartiality of grievance procedures?

I suggest that as department chairmen we might well consider at this early stage of the game what roles we see ourselves playing at the collective bargaining table and after.

I have attempted to assess a number of ways in which I think college and university organization and governance are apt to change as collective bargaining is introduced on our campuses. For the romantics among us many of the prospective changes probably appear unattractive. But need I remind you that these are not happy days for governance anywhere. It is important to remember however that collective bargaining is not a cause of our troubles, but one means of attempting to solve problems that beset faculty and administration alike. As educational leaders in the seventies we must face the challenge of providing alternative solutions or of working to accommodate the techniques of collective bargaining to academe in ways that will minimize any adverse impact on higher education in general and our own institutions in particular.

References

Angell, George W. "Grievance Procedures Under Collective Bargaining: Boon or Burden?" Phi Delta Kappan, 53 (April, 1972), 501-505.

Boyd, William B. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining on University Governance," Liberal Education, 58 (May 1972), 265-271.

Broderius, Bruce W. "Collective Negotiations: An Adversary Process," Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 10 (Spring 1971), 35-44.

Donley, Marshall O., Jr. "Unionization: An Association View," Educational Leadership, 29 (December 1971), 218-224.

Duryea, E. D. and Robert S. Fisk. "Higher Education and Collective Bargaining," Compact, 6 (June 1972), 40-43.

Gainopulos, John W. "Beyond the Bread and Butter Issues," Junior College Journal, 42 (March 1972), 18-19.

Gainopulos, John W. "Collective Bargaining: What Part Should College Presidents Play?" College & University Business, 49 (September 1970), 71-73.

Jacobson, Robert L. "A.A.U.P. Votes Overwhelmingly to Pursue Bargaining: Some See Sacrifice of Association's Character," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 6 (May 15, 1972), 1-2.

Jacobson, Sol. "Faculty Collective Bargaining at the City University of New York," School & Society, 99 (October 1971), 346-349.

Lieberman, Myron. "The Future of Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, 53 (December 1971), 214-216.

McHugh, William F. "Collective Negotiations in Public Higher Education," College & University Business, 47 (December 1969), 41-44, 61-62.

Stillings, Frank S. "A Year Under Collective Bargaining: An Administrator's View," paper presented at Illinois State University, 1971.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND UNIONIZATION: A CASE STUDY AND ANALYSIS

James E. Roever

I agreed to be on the panel at the last minute when Bob Hall indicated that two participants would not be present. I am interested in collective bargaining in colleges and universities. I taught at Hunter College of The City University of New York from 1962 to 1964 and attended a number of sessions held at that time when the United Federation of College Teachers (UFCT) was trying to organize that institution. For the past two years I have been at Queens College of the City University of New York where two collective bargaining agents have represented different segments of the faculty and support personnel. Our contracts expire August 31 and presumably a new contract is now being negotiated.

In anticipation of attending this session, I brought with me, for possible reference, a copy of the "Agreement between The Legislative Conference and the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York," the contract affecting anyone in The City University of New York with the rank of Instructor or above as well as certain support personnel; I invite you to take a look at it if you wish.

I also brought a copy of the "Program of the United Federation of College Teachers for the City University of New York Collective Bargaining Contract" which presents demands by the UFCT that were distributed in May in anticipation of collective bargaining talks to be held this summer.

First, I will present a case study drawing heavily on the UFCT document on the assumption that many of you may not be familiar with some of the kinds of demands that are being made. Secondly, I will make some personal generalizations concerning unionization in higher education.

Case Study

Since the thirties, the faculty of The City University of New York has been represented by the Legislative Conference, a group made up primarily of faculty members who represented their colleagues. Somewhat over three years ago there was an election and at that time it was determined that instructors, assistant professors, associate and full professors, and some support personnel would continue to be represented by the Legislative Conference and that those holding appointments as Lecturers and on adjunct hourly lines would be represented by the United Federation of College Teachers. Thus, there were two bargaining units. Last year the UFCT filed with the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), that's the state equivalent of the NLRB, a proposal which said that there should be one bargaining unit for all faculty, staff, and support personnel. The Legislative Conference did not agree with that and held out for two bargaining units. The Board of Higher Education held out for three units, one each to consist of full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and support personnel. There was a year long series of hearings. At the last of those meetings this spring, which I attended, the Legislative Conference and the UFCT announced that their executive committees had agreed to merge into one organization and that their dues-paying members had voted to merge. PERB then ordered an election by all 16,000 persons who would be affected by the merger. As of a June 7 election, the entire 16,000 member staff, and I will give you the job classifications in a moment, will be represented by the one merged group called the Professional Staff Congress.

The Legislative Conference was affiliated with the National Education Association. The UFCT was affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers as well as some state organizations. The new group claims that it will be affiliated with all of those organizations. That is the situation in which those of us in The City University of New York system find ourselves.

What I will now do is read to you several things from the "Program of The United Federation of College Teachers for The City University of New York Collective Bargaining Contract." In one sense this may be outdated because of the recent merger. On the

other hand, the UFCT published this document under the assumption that the election would favor one bargaining agent and presumably thought they would be in on the new negotiations as a part of the Professional Staff Congress. Also, they did distribute the brochure after the merger was announced so I assume it represents the viewpoints of those in the UFCT part of the Professional Staff Congress. There is no way of knowing the rationale for these statements and there is no official position from the Legislative Conference group within the Professional Staff Congress. As a case study, though, I thought it might be interesting to you to know some of the demands that presumably are being made.

The brochure states: "Professionalism means self governance, The City University must provide for effective professional determination of curriculum, academic and admission standards and power of advice and consent in the final selection of the Chancellors, College Presidents, and Deans.

"The Chancellors must be chosen with the full participation of the university-wide Instructional Staff, which shall exercise also the power of advice and consent in their final selection. They should serve without tenure for a defined term of office and be subject to recall by a two-third's vote of the university staff. No Chancellor should hold office in any university body representative of the staff.

"The Instructional Staff must participate in the search and selection of College Presidents and Deans and have the power of advice and consent in the final selection. All college administrators should serve for defined terms of office, subject to recall by a two-third's vote of the college Instructional Staff.

"No administrator should be granted professional rank and tenure unless the department or University Senate members in the area of discipline agree.

"Instructional Staff elected committees should observe and evaluate Deans, Presidents and Chancellors every three years. The evaluations should be placed before the staffs of the respective colleges and, in the case of Chancellors, before the University Faculty Senate.

"College-wide Personnel and Budget Committees must be democratized by having representatives to such committees elected from each department, with adequate representation for all groups in the Instructional Staff. Candidates for such positions must be individuals other than Department Chairmen."

I will continue to read a rather long section since it specifically applies to department administrators.

"The integrity and autonomy of the department is basic to the proper functioning of the college and the University, and participation in the University through the department is a professional right and responsibility.

"All departmental committees and the Department Chairman should be voted into office by the entire department, with adjunct members entitled to representation and casting fractional votes proportionate to full-time assignments.

"Because Department Chairmen are responsible to the department, they not only should be elected but also subject to recall by two-third's majority of the department. The President must not exercise any veto over the election of Department Chairmen.

"The duties and responsibilities of Department Chairmen have become extremely onerous and border on the unmanageable; therefore, in the interest of democracy and efficiency, we propose that:

--For larger departments, Deputy Chairmen be elected.

--All chairmen and Deputy Chairmen be relieved from at least half the normal responsibilities, including teaching, associated with their departments.

"The assignment of course sections within a department should be accomplished by an elected Program Committee which would consult faculty members as to their preferences.

"Recommendations with respect to appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure should be made by an elected departmental committee proportionate in size to the size of the department and representative of all ranks and disciplines, full and part-time. This departmental committee should be responsible for the conduct of observations and evaluations of all department members who have not completed the probationary period prior to the granting of tenure."

The following quotation discusses rights and privileges of "The Instructional Staff" and defines those persons included in that category:

"All members of the Instructional Staff are vital to the proper functioning of the University. It is appropriate that all Instructional Staff members be encouraged to make their unique contributions to the University by full participation in the life of the University. All Instructional Staff members are entitled to the same or equivalent professional and working conditions, faculty rank and status, eligibility to participate in policy-making bodies, fringe benefits, workload, work year, salary, promotion, tenure, etc. At the same time, each professional group is uniquely qualified to make professional determinations affecting its own members, without interference by others.

"The Instructional Staff referred to in this brochure includes the individuals employed in the following titles: Professor, Associate Professor, Adjunct Titles, Lecturer (Full-Time), Lecturer (Part-Time), Instructor, Research Associate, Research Assistant, Clinical Assistant, Registrar Titles, College Laboratory Technicians, College Physicians, Higher Education Officer Titles, Business Manager Titles, Placement Director, Educational and Vocational Counselor, Urban Centers Professional Staff, and, in the Hunter College Elementary School and Hunter College High School: Chairman of Department, Teacher Titles, Guidance Counselor, Librarian, College Laboratory Technician; and, in the Early Childhood Centers: Teacher, Assistant Teacher."

Now I will present several briefer items that I have selected at random to give you a cross section of the type of demands that are contained in the brochure. I added several in response to Mr. Cowperthwaite's comments.

"All members of the Instructional Staff who do not perform their major work in the classroom--e.g., Higher Education Officers, Student Development personnel, Business Managers, College Laboratory Technicians, Librarians, and all others performing educational duties outside the classroom--must become members of a department with all rights and privileges thereof, including participation in an election to departmental and college P&B (Personnel and Budget) committees and election of Department Chairmen. Where necessary, new departments should be created."

"The Instructional Staff member must have the right to inspect and to have copies of his personnel file. This personnel file must be limited to those matters affecting his academic performance. There must be no additional or confidential personnel file.

"Materials not in the file must not be submitted as evidence in any proceedings affecting a staff member."

"All observations must be animated by a desire to improve the professional performance of the staff member being observed. A balance must be struck in observations so that there are enough made by different staff members during the semester to provide a fair composite of performance, yet too many observations must be avoided because they take on the form of harassment.

"Observations should be made by individuals who have an intimate knowledge of the area under observation. All observations must be followed by an observation conference between the person being observed and the observer with the involvement of a member of the departmental committee elected for purposes of evaluation.

"Written observation reports by the observer should be shown to the individual observed for his initialing and comment. A copy of this report should then be given to the person observed and the original placed in his personnel file.

"All tenured Instructional Staff should not be subject to observation unless it is voluntarily requested by the staff member."

"A seniority list must be established University-wide for each staff member in order of original employment in the areas of competence. Reduction in force must follow this central list. Individuals not reappointed should be placed upon a preferential hiring list for three years with those having longest seniority called first."

"The Instructional Staff must be fully supported by the budget. Therefore, for the duration of this contract, no member of the Instructional Staff should be let go because of budgetary reasons."

"In accordance with the standards of desirable practice of the AAUP and those established as far back as June 1966 by the City University Master Plan, we advocate a maximum of nine (9) teaching hours of undergraduate instruction, and six (6) hours for graduate instruction or a combination of graduate and undergraduate instruction. No more than 75 students should be assigned to an undergraduate instructor per semester. For normal recitation sessions there must be no more than twenty-five students per class. These numbers could be reduced where necessary by vote of the department. Remedial classes must be held to a maximum of fifteen students."

"At least 30% of the full-time Instructional Staff (exclusive of administrators holding concurrent professorial rank) must be full Professors; 30% must be Associate Professors; and 30% must be Assistant Professors. This percentage must apply to each college. No department in a given college should be permitted to be more than 5% below this percentage.

"No more than and no less than 10% of the Instructional staff should be Instructors/Lecturers."

"Any vacancy which occurs in any unit of the City University must be publicized to all members of the Instructional Staff setting forth the qualifications for such position. Incumbent members of the Instructional Staff who meet these qualifications should be given preference in order of seniority."

"A salary schedule ranging from $17,500 to $36,500 should be instituted."

"Mandatory standards must include a minimum of 120 square feet of office space, with no more than two staff members in each office; a minimum of one telephone for each two staff members; secretarial service to the extent of one full-time secretary for each five full-time staff members..."

"Vacation schedules including intersession and spring and winter recesses must apply to all members of the Instructional Staff in both day and evening sessions, including the professional Library staff, Registrar staff, Business Manager staff, College Laboratory Technicians, Counselors, Higher Education Officer series, Lecturers in the Urban Centers, Research Associates and Assistants, and College Physicians.

"If any staff are needed prior to classes being in session, they must be paid pro-rata for the days worked."

"Pregnant women members of the staff may continue working as long as they are able to work. One week prior to giving birth and one week after giving birth must be counted as sick leave. A male staff member whose wife is pregnant should be given one week prior and one week after the birth as paid sick leave for paternity leave."

"Three million dollars must be budgeted and set aside annually to support research evaluation and development. The grants may include support for efforts in scholarly discipline areas, evaluations of university programs (Open Admissions, remediation, counselling, SEEK, College Discovery, Urban Centers, etc.), and innovative experiments in educational design."

"Librarians should enjoy the same work year and vacation as the other Instructional Staff; if services are required during intersession, Christmas and Easter Holidays and summer, commensurate pay should be granted.

"The work week should consist of not more than 30 hours to be divided by an optional four- or five-day week.

"Librarians must not be burdened with clerical work. There should be two library clerks for every professional Librarian."

Generalizations Concerning Unionization in Higher Education

Now I wish to make several generalizations that grow out of my experience as Director of Graduate Studies in the Communication Arts and Sciences Department as well as other personal experiences, including interaction with two department chairmen, during the past two years at Queens College.

My first comment is in disagreement with Anita Taylor. My experience is that there is a likelihood of less peer judgment involved in faculty promotion and in tenure than in the past. Let me give you an example. Our current contract says that the Personnel and Budget Committee of the department, which is elected for three years to run concurrently with the term of the department chairman who is also elected for three years (he serves as the chairman of the Personnel and Budget Committee), is to make recommendations to the Personnel and Budget Committee of the College with reference to those persons who should be appointed and reappointed and those who should be promoted or be granted tenure. The College Personnel and Budget Committee then makes recommendations to the Board of Higher Education. The Personnel and Budget Committee, which is elected democratically by the department, presumably consists of peers who are to evaluate other members of the department and who serve as the representatives of the department. Let us assume the department committee votes not to reappoint a faculty member. Let us assume further that the college committee sustains that recommendation. A faculty member, represented by his union, may file a grievance with the department. Given no "satisfaction" there, he may file a grievance with the college. Given no "satisfaction" there, he may file a grievance with the Office of the Chancellor. Given no "satisfaction" there, the case goes to binding arbitration. The individual as judged by the committees, beginning with his peers who represent the department, may be allowed to stay on when, in fact, it is the judgment of his peers that he should not. Hence, a judgment from binding arbitration, in favor of a faculty member in reality may be a judgment against the department. Peer judgment, in that case, does not prevail.

Furthermore, the individual faculty member has the right to appeal all the way up the line; the department or the college or the Office of the Chancellor does not have the right to appeal once a case has been determined in favor of an individual faculty member who has appealed. Once again the system is biased against peer judgment.

I understand, incidentally, that these judgments are often in favor of individuals appealing because of technicalities, a term that should become familiar to those of you who will, in the future, find yourselves on the administrative side of the collective bargaining table. One example can be found in cases wherein the UFCT contract requires several "negative" evaluations from peers. A faculty member must be observed and an evaluation written each semester. I believe that two negative evaluations out of three must be reported before a person who is a Lecturer, for example, may be dismissed. Furthermore, I believe that it most specifically states in an evaluation that it is "negative". There have been cases, I am told, in which the judgment was in fact negative but technicalities, such as no two negative evaluations, failure to get a "negatively stated" evaluation in a person's folder, or failure to clearly state a negative evaluation before a deadline, resulted in a person not being dismissed.

I predict that a goodly number of cases taken to arbitration are going to be lost on technicalities; particularly, in the early days of the new experience of arbitration will this be the case. So as a department chairman who is coming under one of these contracts you should acquaint yourself with the fine print and the deadlines so that you can begin to play your role as the management expert in labor law.

Even if a case is not lost on a technicality, I invite you to think of the probability of a member of a faculty receiving two negative evaluations in three semesters based on a one-observation-per-semester system with outside observers who come in for one class session each.

This may mean that you will not be able to dismiss someone because you can get another who is better; it means, if you will, that you can not apply relative academic criteria in your staff recommendations.

If these kinds of contracts are proliferated, and I believe they will be, then one of the most important things that chairmen and Personnel and Budget Committees, or their equivalents, must do is focus on initial hiring. I think that in the City University it will become increasingly difficult to dismiss anyone; hence, it will become increasingly important to conduct intensive initial screening and perhaps hire persons who have already proven themselves rather than the young, often bright and

eager, potential scholars on whom you would have to take more of a chance.

All of this points out one of the larger issues. What is apparently occurring is that unions are forcing a labor-management paradigm onto the colleges even though that paradigm may eventually work against the academic goals of the institution. Faculty may be pitted against administration--labor against management. One of the reasons our previous chairman, Robert Cathcart, who is known to many of you, chose not to stand for reelection was that he found himself in the role of adversary to many of the people who were his peers and he spent much of his time preparing arbitration cases that had to deal with the kind of things that he, as an academician in a university, felt should not be dealt with in the context of arbitration.

The person who agrees to be an administrator is going to be making an additional choice at the same time. Is he labor or is he management? At the spring hearing before the Public Employment Relations Board, which I mentioned earlier, I heard a representative of the UFCT say to one of the vice-chancellors, who as a matter of fact has an article in the Bulletin of the Association of Departments of English that you were handed this morning, "You guys need to get your own bargaining agent." "You guys" is the administration.

And of course, the logical extension of this is a shift in the roles of administrators followed by hiring of administrators not for their academic excellence and ability to recognize and work with colleagues but rather for their techniques for management and arbitration. Your new dean may be an expert in labor-management affairs who knows little or nothing about the substantive areas represented by the departments under him.

--In examining the transcript of my remarks prior to publication, I added the following quotation which, I believe, points out the potential changes in relationships among faculty and administration: "Paul R. Anderson, president of Temple University, recently received a request for faculty participation in the selection of a new vice-president for labor relations.

"In the past, the request would have been granted without much question. Temple, like most universities, enlists many faculty members to help pick its top administrators.

"But this time Mr. Anderson isn't so sure. His reason: Temple's 1,380 faculty members will vote this week on whether or not to be represented by a union. 'I'm just not sure they ought to be picking the man who's going to sit on the other side of the bargaining table,' Mr. Anderson says.

"Further, if Temple faculty members vote in favor of collective bargaining, as they are expected to do, Mr. Anderson isn't even sure that they ought to be involved in picking any administrators--even those, such as the vice-president for academic affairs, who have a direct involvement in faculty concerns." (The Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (October 24, 1972), 1.)--

The day may not be far away when the administrator will have to make his choice or else become an intentional schizophrenic who shifts from hour to hour between being an administrator and a faculty member.

A number of things that show up in contracts, it seems to me, indicate additional hard core labor-management thinking and not the thought of the needs of the college and its students. For example, in our current contract there is no such thing as a graduate teaching assistant, although there is a graduate assistant for research So, graduate students in our M.A. program are hired as Lecturers Part-Time for those kinds of positions you would fill with graduate teaching assistants. Once hired as Lecturers Part-Time, as long as they remain students in good standing in the City University, and not necessarily at Queens College, we can not terminate their employment without those successive negative evaluations I mentioned earlier. One of the problems we are faced with currently is that we would like to have some students, who have finished their work with us and are in Ph.D. programs elsewhere in the City University or who have finished all but their theses, terminate their employment to make room for new students who need financial assistance. In a time of competition for graduate students and increased pressures from productivity, in the form of student-instructor ratios, it hurts us in the form of lower enrollment in graduate courses. And, if we meet this situation with withdrawal of Lecture-ships Part-Time and make only full-time appointments with persons who already hold

advanced degrees--and we could do that--then we still hurt ourselves in terms of cutting enrollment because we do not have the financial assistance to offer excellent students who will go elsewhere where financial aid is available. And if you think it undesirable to face a colleague on your full-time faculty across the grievance table, try it with one of your former graduate students who argues he should be kept on for three years since he has not had negative evaluations.

Responding to the need for increased faculty-student interaction and closer advising of students, our department recently adopted a preregistration procedure for all majors. This meant close contact with many students and required the time of many faculty members. Note that the UFCT has indicated that they want to provide for those students who have come in during open enrollment, many of whom would be advised under our new system. But, at the same time, UFCT representatives have stated that Lecturers can not be given assignments to serve on committees or to advise students. All Lecturers have to do is teach. A Lecturer, at a starting salary of over $12,000, can teach and go home. That, it seems to me, is not a perceptive point of view considering the needs of departments and students in those departments. As a matter of fact, it even prevents those Lecturers who want to take part in the advising program from so doing.

A similar example of a union not taking the needs of a department and its students into account is the recommendation restricting class size that I read to you earlier. In our department, faculty members have been and are developing large section, multimedia classes in an attempt to meet the problems of increased enrollment and increased demand for courses. This next fall we will have such courses as "Introduction to Communication Theory," "Introduction to Mass Communications," "Fundamentals of Film Production," and "Psychology of Speech" taught in large sections. If the demand to limit class size were to be adopted, it would mean that either we could not do what we had planned to do or we would have to violate that contract in order to offer those courses. The proposal that I read to you provides for <u>reduction</u> of those quotas by department vote but does not provide for an <u>increase</u> of those quotas by department vote.

An important issue involves tenure. If the contract that is now under negotiation goes the way the UFCT wants, and the way I think it will go, that will mean that the Business Manager, the Librarian, and the College Physician, for example, will also be up for tenure during the sixth year. If you go back to the traditional AAUP definition of tenure in terms of established competency in teaching and research, judged by knowledgeable peers in an area, then it becomes difficult to determine the criteria one would apply to support personnel. What is the librarian's competency and in reference to what when it comes to tenure?

I wish to note that most of the items I have discussed with you have concerned conditions of employment and not salary. As you probably know, the salaries in The City University of New York, at least on an absolute scale, are among the best in the country. Hence, bargaining settles down to conditions of employment. So, some of you may enter into collective bargaining agreements on the grounds that your needs are for better collective bargaining power in arriving at salaries; and for some schools where you have experienced minimal or no increases, that is a pretty good reason. But, if or when you do find yourselves out of the initial salary stage, then you will find yourselves involved in these same issues I have discussed.

So, my advice is to think about these issues I have spoken of, and those spoken of by others, in the very beginning when you are determining whether to have collective bargaining and determining who shall do the collective bargaining. Get involved and encourage your faculty members to get involved. Many of the things I have described, and of which I have become critical in many cases, have probably come about because of faculty apathy in the beginning. In many cases, as well, I think they have come about because faculty members elected bargaining agents, those bargaining agents became too enthralled with their power and eventually did not consult faculty and departments (with the exception of those politically minded faculty members who seek out the action of unionism), and eventually unions emerged demanding some things beyond our faculty imaginations. Those things often were not, or are not, consistent with the desire for academic excellence in

a department.

At this point, I would like to disagree with one point Mr. Cowperthwaite made. I do not think it a marginal group of people who decided the one unit-one bargaining agent for the City University of New York. When the election was held a month ago, about 8,000 staff members of a possible 16,000 voted and only about 900 people on that entire staff voted against the one unit. Less than that voted against the elected bargaining agent. So, while I did not expect it to be carried by that much, it seems to me that it was not determined by a marginal group of people, although it may be marginal people who benefit in many cases.

Finally, let me state my bias rather than imply it. I have, through my experiences at the City University of New York, become very much anti-UFCT and moderately pro-Legislative Conference. So the merger has produced a highly dissonant situation for me. My presentation here has focused on UFCT generated proposals since they were the only ones available to me. Furthermore, I am of the mind that in an institution as large as The City University of New York some form of collective bargaining is inevitable and perhaps necessary; then, the issue becomes one of getting increased involvement, or whatever else it takes, from faculty and concerned personnel to arrive at meaningful programs that reflect the real needs of students, faculty, administrators, and departments as a whole. That involvement makes time demands that may cut into teaching and research activities. The task is not an easy one but it may be a necessary one for the preservation of academic excellence.

PART IV

IMPLICATIONS OF FACULTY ORGANIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

It was the assigned task of the final three speakers of the Seminar to evaluate and synthesize the discussions of the previous sessions and to present some suggestions for implementation. To Robert C. Jeffrey fell the task of reviewing methods of evaluating faculty members and demonstrating how evaluations effect accountability. Samuel L. Becker was charged with suggesting ways to evaluate academic programs for the best results in accountability. And, Ernest E. Ettlich discussed the role of the ADASC and evaluation processes.

From these presentations and all of those that preceded them, came the initial impetus for the position papers. The position papers constitute Part V.

EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Robert C. Jeffrey

Introduction

While listening yesterday to the talks about collective bargaining, I found left unanswered a question, the answer to which may have been obvious to some, but not at all obvious to me. The question is: What has given rise to collective bargaining in institutions of higher learning? I wonder if it isn't simply the phenomenon of an idea whose time has come, and as it creeps up on us, we accept it without serious questioning. Another possible reason compelling some to embrace collective bargaining is that we have done an inadequate job of evaluating faculty and of following through on some conclusions once arrived at. My responsibility is to talk about evaluation of faculty for retention, tenure, promotion and salary increase. I would like to divide the consideration of evaluation by discussing first, procedures and second, criteria. I'll try to be specific while at the same time drawing some generalizations.

Procedure

The procedures governing promotion and salary increases range from personal and informal to very careful and even elaborate analyses that strive for maximum objectivity. There certainly is no perfect system of evaluation for making these kinds of decisions, and identical or even similar systems are not necessarily good for all departments - even departments within the same university. But I think the proper concern for procedure can have several beneficial results. First, if we concern ourselves with procedure, those who initiate and confer recommendations will be forced to consider the adequacy and sources of information dictating their judgments. Many times we tend to base our decisions for promotion, salary increases, and tenure on what exists in the personnel folder for the members of our faculty. I have seen enough personnel folders in my own department and in other departments to know they are woefully inadequate.

Second, concern with procedure should yield a greater degree of continuity and consistency and reduce the likelihood of arbitrary decisions. Such arbitrary decisions are particularly prevalent in larger colleges and universities and larger departments, where sometimes the chairmen of committees on tenure and salaries lack sufficient familiarity with the person under consideration.

Another benefit of attentiveness to procedure is that it should help to reassure faculty members that each will receive equal consideration in these important matters and that avenues for review and appeal are available to them.

A fourth advantage of adopting more formal procedures is that it will require focusing the responsibility for and more careful justification of the exercise of discretionary authority.

Variations exist in the procedures by which promotion and salary decisions are made, but most of these variations reflect a great deal of tradition. The effect of strong chairmen and conscientious departmental committees are often felt. However, some rather new and experimental approaches to departmental management of salary increases, promotions and tenure exist. Most departments use a governing committee within the department to make these decisions, a procedure much more expeditious in smaller departments than the committee structure. A few departments that I know of are using assistant professors and instructors as members of committees to make decisions on salary and promotions - a healthy direction for two reasons. First, the younger members of the faculty become involved in the decision making processes - a sound communicative device. Second, this procedure reassures the members of the faculty, particularly in the lower ranks (instructors and assistant professors), that they are represented, thereby reducing some of the anxieties they might have of "old men sitting in high places" making arbitrary decisions affecting their lives. Strong difference of opinion is expressed about the appropriate role of young professors, but I think that

anything that can be done to reduce the mystery of the decision-making process on the departmental level is worthwhile.

The department that is unwilling to involve lower rank professors in the governing apparatus in some fashion has a special responsibility to fully inform all faculty members of departmental promotion and salary policies. The kinds of materials to be supplied for personnel files should be known by all. Dates of preliminary and final reviews should be publicized. Participants in such reviews should be announced. Criteria by which performance is judged should be clearly stated. The ways such information is developed should be made available. Minimum and/or maximum periods of service required for promotion, salary and tenure should be accessible. It is possible for a department to publish all of this, and it probably would be beneficial to do so, but I think it is equally important that the chairman or an appropriate member of the governing committee personally inform each new faculty member, and even "older" faculty members, of these decisions.

It is important, too, for faculty members to understand that the department's action is not final. A professor should know what appeal procedures are available to him and be assured that he may follow those appeal procedures without incurring prejudice. We all know, being in communication, that a well informed constituency is much more secure than an uninformed constituency. The latter might well develop fantasies about how decisions are made. But developing sound criteria is as important as establishing defined procedures.

Criteria

Most administrators agree today that the major functions of universities, or of professors in universities, are threefold: teaching, research and scholarly activities, and certain kinds of public services, although public service is generally not thought to be one of the major criteria for promotion and salary increases on a quantitative scale. Teaching is traditionally accepted as the primary function of the university, and some suggestions for evaluating teaching effectiveness are available. Teaching, defined, is not the mere transmittal of information, and we ought to be aware of that. It flourishes best when accompanied by research and other forms of scholarly activity. In such an atmosphere, the teacher not only transmits information, but he evaluates it, rearranges it, questions it, and adds to it. Even though all results of research activity do not find their way into the classroom, the condition of mind of the active scholar is impressed upon his teaching and will influence at least some of his students to become lifelong scholars.

So, too, the public service role of the university is best promoted by those actively engaged in research and scholarly activities, and whose attentions are focused on new problems or emerging conditions that confront persons and institutions in responsible and decision-making roles in our society. The service functions of faculty members are probably better understood if those services enter the public domain through publications. Administrators seem to be much more interested in research activities or teaching functions of professors who carry those activities or functions into the community than of service roles such as serving on university or departmental committees. Those, of course, are important, too, and should be considered. A former chairman of the Board of Regents of a major university has publicly denigrated faculty members who participate in what he calls the "Faculty Self-Devised Committee Structure." He believes the faculty creates committees for itself to use as an excuse for not meeting classes.

Although there is general agreement that the three criteria determining promotion and salary recommendations are teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service, there is less agreement regarding evaluation of performance in these three functions and the relative weight to be assigned each. One thing is clear; it is difficult, demanding, and time consuming to build complete files for all faculty members, to collect additional information and outside judgments, to assess student comment or

evaluation, to compare faculty performance, to make qualitative distinctions, and to balance these and other considerations in light of the variety of talents required to accomplish departmental goals. Some specifics about each of these criteria, however, can be developed.

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching quality and effectiveness is a consistently noted criterion for promotion and salary increases, although it seems to have more effect on salary decisions than on promotion recommendations. If there is neither a total breakdown of classroom rapport nor the receipt of a teaching excellence award, it is assumed that the professor is doing at least adequate teaching, and at this point other criteria tend to outweigh the teaching criterion. Some departments assume that the university's reputation is determined primarily by the research, publication and scholarly activities of the faculty, and that these should be rewarded first. Others seem to be willing to treat good teaching of equal importance, but plead disagreement about what constitutes good teaching and hide behind the problem of evaluation. Some feeling also exists that the central administration and deans, although specifically requiring evidence of teaching excellence, assign more weight to research and publication records when reviewing promotion and salary recommendations. Responsible teaching is as much a qualification for promotion and salary increases as good research, and this fact ought not be dodged on the grounds that the latter is easier to discern than the former. It is true that the determination of teaching excellence will always contain an element of personal and subjective judgment, but much can be done to develop a more orderly presentation of the facts on which such judgments are based. Among the questions to be asked in measuring teaching performance are the following:

1. Are the minimum essentials of the teaching function performed? This question can be answered partially by examining such things as preparation of course outlines; syllabi and other materials for student use; attention to bookstore and library requirements; regular attendance in classes; and university work standards measured by reading assignments, papers or projects, and examinations. Grading that indicates efforts to be discriminating and to maintain standards is a measure of minimum essentials, as is regular availability during announced office hours and reasonably effective contact with students.
2. Is there evidence of efforts to stay abreast of the subject? This can be measured in terms of frequency of revising lectures or demonstrations, development of new syllabi, adoption of new texts or teaching materials, variation in the presentation of subject matter, and proposing new courses or seminar subjects including team or interdisciplinary teaching.
3. How effective is the teaching? This can be measured by examining the teacher's organization, preparation, control of or familiarity with materials; the manner of presentation; classroom style; and forms and degree of student responsiveness.
4. In what kinds of teaching situations or at what levels is the faculty member more effective? We can measure this by examining the faculty member's teaching in large and small classes, lectures and seminars, individual tutorial and research supervision, lower division, upper division, or graduate student courses.
5. If he supervises graduate students, what quality of student is attracted to him, and what is the apparent quality of the M.A. and Ph.D. work? To answer this question we have to examine the number and quality of theses and dissertations supervised and the number of committees he serves on.
6. What are his teaching-related activities, and how effectively are they carried out? Such things can be examined as advising and counseling (not only at times of registration), appropriate out-of-class relations with students, assistance to student organizations or honor societies, and contributions to departmental curriculum review or course planning.

None of these questions can be answered in an ad hoc fashion when promotion or salary recommendations are requested. Chairmen and graduate and undergraduate advisors should be able to supply specific information on certain points. Other valuable sources of information are available and useful only if there is advanced thought about how they may be exploited. The chairman and committees should constantly collect course outlines and syllabi to be placed in the files along with formal written student evaluations or less formal consultations with selected students, especially majors and graduating seniors for the undergraduate teacher. Written accounts of the informal consultations should be placed in the files. Assigning a senior professor as an advisor to two or three younger faculty members can be useful. Occasional unannounced classroom or laboratory visits might be planned. Although such visits are deplored by professors, I think the day has come that we should reject the belief that a man's classroom is his private domain. We have to know what kind of job the professor is doing and there are few other ways of measuring his effectiveness. We have to develop an attitude of accountability in the classroom and part of that accountability is to be observed. This will become increasingly important as the number of teaching assistants diminish in colleges and universities, a trend measurable on many campuses throughout the country. That kind of teaching laboratory is not going to be with us in the large numbers it has been in the past, and we are going to be forced to hire more and more teachers who have never been in a classroom.

Reviewing theses and dissertations written under a faculty member's supervision and perhaps soliciting the opinion of someone in another department or institution is current practice in some institutions. Significant achievements by students closely assisted or supervised by a faculty member should be noted and filed in his personnel folder.

Research and Scholarly Performance

It is widely agreed that evidence of continuing research and scholarly activity is an important consideration affecting promotion and salary recommendations. In many departments it appears to be the most important consideration, especially for promotion, tenure, and rank. One chairman interviewed said he would promote a good researcher who is a poor teacher but not someone in whom the qualities were reversed. Another said his department considers a man for promotion only after he has received inquiries from other schools, inquiries that are likely to result from exposure through publications. While there is general agreement that a record of research and scholarly activity is desirable and probably even mandatory, there is some divergence in the way evidence of research activity is collected and evaluated and the care with which its importance is judged. There are several bases for measuring research. First, we should examine the types of publications: books, monographs, articles and papers for scholarly journals and learned societies, compositions, performances in other creative arts productions. Some faculty members list as publications all of the handouts they distribute in classes. One would think they were great scholars; they do a lot of mimeographing.

Other measures of research include delivering invited papers, advising and consulting on subjects of recognized expertise or research interest, ability to attract grants in support of research and to obtain grant renewals, ability to attract graduate students from other institutions. Evidence of research in progress that may issue as working papers or first draft chapters are important. I think we tend to underrate or overlook work in progress, believing, sometimes justifiably, that work in progress is just imagination on the part of the faculty member. But some work in progress is exceedingly significant and may result in five to fifteen years, in some significant publication. We should examine work in progress with a more critical eye than we have in the past. Research for course development is equally important. A need exists for imagination in developing measures of research ability.

Service

The third criterion for promotion is service. This criterion is weighted only slightly in promotion decisions but is cited more often in justification of salary increases. Service usually includes activities other than teaching and research, both within and outside the university. Chairmen need to remind departmental governing bodies of particularly deserving service records and to make their own recommendations. Chairmen, deans and other officials have a particular obligation to take initiative in recognizing service since they are often the only persons who know the time required or the effectiveness with which service tasks are undertaken. As a matter of course, department chairmen ought to be notified when a faculty member is appointed to any committee or other special assignment by a dean or other official. Particularly difficult or effective service should be noted in a memo sent to the department for the faculty member's personnel file. These appointment notices and memos can be useful to deans and other officials when promotions and salary recommendations are under review. Above all, the quality of the work of faculty members should be evaluated as much as the quantity.

Too often in the past our decisions for salary increases and promotions have been made by closed societies; they have been made on an ad hoc basis; they have been made with minimal evidence to support the decisions. In this era of accountability, we can no longer tolerate such acts. New demands for accountability will make the position of departmental chairman increasingly less attractive unless we are prepared to meet those demands by anticipating them and by continually collecting information to satisfy them.

THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Samuel L. Becker

Every parent who has ever managed to live through the teenage years of his children is more than familiar with the evanescent norms that shape their children one way one week, and another way the next. We joke and laugh about these teen-age fads--whenever we can do so through our tears, that is.

Such fads that sweep the teen-age community are cause enough to weep. Even greater cause for many of us, though, are the fads that almost as regularly sweep the educational community. Just in recent times, among others, we have had educational television, then programed instruction, then behavioral objectives, and now "accountability" or, as it more often manifests itself in the public schools, "performance contracting."

Though I have observed the course of teenage fads over many years, I have not yet discovered the motive forces--those forces that give rise to them, that mark their peak, and that signal their decline. With educational fads, on the other hand, I think that I can observe some patterns. A strong motive force behind the rise of many of them is the push for efficiency, for educating more students or educating them better with less money. As each fad approaches its peak, we can usually see a plethora of studies purporting to demonstrate the usefulness of the particular practice. This is followed by the realization that most of the studies have not been well done and that, therefore, their results are questionable. So well-done, large-scale studies follow, and the results of these usually mark the beginning of the decline. Such a large-scale study may well have just been done on performance contracting. After a great many small demonstration studies, the United States Office of Economic Opportunity was so confident of the success of performance contracting that it spent over six-million dollars in a large, nation-wide study of performance contracting with under-achieving students. Thirty-one companies bid for the opportunity to participate, even though they would be paid only for each student who was able to gain one school year of growth in reading and arithmetic during the school year. Half or more of those companies that participated are now out of business. The pupils in the experiment fell far short of the goal. Even more important, when the gains on these youngsters were compared to the gains of an equal number of comparable pupils in control groups, no effects of performance contracting could be detected.[1]

I am not suggesting here that all of these fads are worthless or that we ignore them. Obviously, many have within them the seeds for new blossoms in the educational garden--new growth that can contribute to the achievement of our varied missions. What I am suggesting is that we must avoid both kinds of signal responses which some members of the academic community consistently make to new developments. Some of us tend habitually to pooh-pooh anything new--asserting either that it is not, in fact, new at all or else that it is useless or even destructive. Others of us tend, just as habitually, to immediately gather every new development to our institutional bosoms, either because we perceive that government and foundation grants tend to go to innovators or else because we are habitually dissatisfied with what we are doing and so are always ready to try something new. I hope that we here can find some middle ground--that we can analyze these new developments to discover the potential strengths and weaknesses and to develop means of capitalizing on the former while minimizing the latter. This is the framework within which I will be discussing faculty organization, accountability, and the evaluation of academic programs.

The recent developments in faculty organization and in accountability which we have been discussing at this conference have quite different sorts of implications for the evaluation of academic programs or of departments. Therefore, I will consider them separately; first faculty organization and then accountability.

Faculty Organization

We have talked at this conference primarily about one type of faculty organization, the union or something which approaches the union. I believe that we should also consider another type of faculty organization, that within each institution--the organization into departments, colleges, and other assorted units. Both of these kinds of organization can affect the degrees of freedom that we have for an adequate evaluation of academic programs and departments.

As teaching unions gather strength, they may inhibit or attempt to inhibit the gathering of some of the kinds of data that are needed for an adequate assessment of a department's effectiveness. Since the effectiveness is,in large part, the cumulative effectiveness of the faculty members within the department, we must have the freedom to assess as completely as we can the effectiveness of each individual faculty member. We must be able to get student ratings of each individual teacher, as well as student ratings of courses and programs. We must also attempt to get some comparative data on the performance of students who have worked under each faculty member. (I will return to this point later when I discuss accountability.) Any restrictions which union contracts place upon the gathering and use of such data will limit the validity of departmental evaluations.

Departmental and college structures may inhibit such evaluations in another way. Though I am a fervent believer in departmental autonomy, as I assume you are, we must recognize that such autonomy may eliminate what ought to be some of the major criteria in the evaluation of a department. One such criterion is the degree to which a department's course offerings serve the students of other departments and colleges, as opposed to serving only or primarily its majors. The other related criterion is how well a department uses what is available from other departments. We must get away from the sort of departmental autonomy which leads us to believe that only the faculty in a department are qualified to determine what a department ought to teach or who we ought to teach it to. Our departments of speech communication and theatre ought to be evaluated not only on the basis of the evidence of how effectively we are meeting the learning needs of our majors, but also whether we are meeting the learning needs of students in American Civilization (with our Public Address courses), of students in pre-law (with our Argumentation and Persuasion courses), of students in English (with our dramatic literature and Rhetorical Theory courses), and students in Journalism and Art (with our broadcasting and film courses), etc. We ought also to be evaluated on how well we use the courses from other departments to educate our students more effectively and efficiently. We should be asked whether we insist on teaching our own statistics courses when there are better statistics courses taught by the department of Psychology or Mathematics, or our own historiography courses when they can be better taught by a specialist in the History department, etc. When we insist on teaching such courses when there are substantial courses in the departments which profess primary expertise in those areas, we are wasting our resources and not properly serving our students.

There is another aspect of departmental service which needs to be taken account of in any departmental evaluation. Not only must we assess the degree to which each department's offerings serve the needs of other departments and colleges; we must also consider the degree to which its offerings are appropriate for the student body and the region which it serves.[2] No longer can a department set its goals and determine its programs independent of community needs. If a region needs help with dialects or the development of skills in organizing and maintaining groups for community action programs, and we offer only oral interpretation, formal public speaking, and the history of rhetorical theory, serious questions should be raised about whether we deserve the financial support of that community.

Accountability

Let us consider now some of the questions raised by the current push for accountability. The principle of accountability is good, one with which none of us can argue. Clearly, we in the colleges and universities must be accountable to the public which supports us and to those agencies which stand between us and the public. The principle of accountability is fine. I am less sure about the practice. In principle, an accountability system measures the input to an institution (the dollars allocated) against the output (the amount of education). In practice, our measure of dollars seems to be pretty good, but I have serious reservations about the measure of education that we have been using. That measure, as far as I can see, appears to be student credit hours generated. The amount or quality of learning which each of those credit hours represents seldom if ever gets taken into account. Until these factors are taken into account, this method of assessing the work of colleges and universities or of departments is useless, if not seriously deleterious. A department or an institution is not like a department store where one's primary concern is rapid turnover and, hence, maximum profit (or minimum loss). Basing evaluations of departments or institutions solely, or even primarily, on the average cost of student credit hours generated encourages a variety of practices which, in the long run, will lower the quality of education. It will encourage a department to keep promotions and tenure to a minimum and have rapid turnover of faculty instead because senior faculty cost more money and don't generate any more credit hours than inexperienced instructors or assistant professors. It will discourage a department from offering independent study and small group seminars, or keeping ample office hours and carrying on research.

Accountability procedures will not encourage these counter-productive practices if we build in proper measures of educational effectiveness--if we can successfully combine valid measures of effectiveness with our measures of efficiency. The problem is that up until now, no institution that I can discover has been successful in combining them.

The reason for this failure I believe is clear. We have been trying to measure the effectiveness of education at too macroscopic a level; we have been trying to find a single measure which can be applied to any of the graduates of an institution. Up until now--and I see no possibility for predicting anything different in the future--colleges and universities have been spectacularly unsuccessful in defining their institutional goals in a meaningful way--in a way that makes possible the assessment of the degree to which those goals have been met. Being realistic, such attempts can probably never succeed except in a highly specialized professional institution such as a law or medical school where at least some of the goals are clearly defined by the licensing examinations. Otherwise, especially in the liberal arts college, the educational goals of the various students and the various departments are so heterogeneous that the institutional goals have little value except to impress parents and potential donors.

Even when such substantive tests as the Area Tests of the Graduate Record Examination are used, the effects of a college are virtually impossible to determine. Part of the difficulty is due to differences in initial abilities of different college populations. However, even when something like the aptitude test of the College Entrance Examination Board or of the American College Testing program is used to control for initial differences, we can still detect little effect of different colleges. The correlations found between these entrance examination tests and the area tests is very high--often in the .90s. This means that there is not much variability left that a college can influence.[3]

Because of these various problems of evaluating effectiveness at the moment, some observers have suggested that while we are working on this problem we go ahead and evaluate solely on the basis of economic efficiency. Offhand this seems reasonable, but there are underlying dangers. In striving for economic efficiency, we could destroy

some of the major values of higher education long before we come up with satisfactory means of assessing those values so that we can work them into the formulae.

In spite of these arguments, which neither the general public nor the governing bodies of our institutions probably find as compelling as we do, the trend toward using accountability procedures for assessing institutions and parts of institutions will undoubtedly continue, if not accelerate. If we are to avoid or minimize the dangers in the system, if we do not want to live with cost per student credit hour as the major criterion of the quality of job we are doing, we must develop valid measures of learning which can be built in as major factors in the accountability formulae. Not only would such measures overcome the major criticisms of accountability procedures, they would be a positive gain, for they would give students, faculty, administrators, and the public a reasonable basis for assessing a department or institution.

In my opinion, we will not be able to develop valid measures of institutional effect if we continue to concentrate on the very general measures of the impact of colleges which have been attempted in the past. It is probably even useless--at least at this point in time--to attempt to develop criteria for departments or programs. The futility of attempting this in our field, for example, is demonstrated by the failure of experts in the Educational Testing Service, even with the cooperation of subject-matter experts from our field, to develop a satisfactory area test for speech communication as part of the Graduate Record Examination. Therefore, instead of trying and failing at that task again, we ought to begin with the courses or clusters of courses which tend to be taught in most departments or institutions and develop tests for them which can be used in assessing the quality of teaching in different institutions.

The measures that I am advocating cannot be developed by college or university administrators, or by the accountants or Ph.D.'s in educational administration who are probably planning most of the accountability systems, even if they should be interested in doing so. Only those of us who profess expertise in the various subject matter areas can do this. And, if we are to do it meaningfully, it must be done on a national basis. This means that we here and our colleagues must do the job for the field of speech communication, and that we can only do the job well if we coordinate our efforts through an organization such as the Speech Communication Association or the Association for Departments and Administrators of Speech Communication.

Standardized tests of this sort should be developed for all of the key courses or clusters of courses where there is consensus among institutions on course goals. Where such agreement does not exist, we must work toward bringing it about.

Lest I seem overly optimistic, I would point out that I recognize the difficulties of getting agreement on course goals from different institutions--even in a field such as ours where we profess expertise in problem-solving discussion. Certainly our past efforts at assessing the effects of speech communication courses have not been very successful. Consider, for example, the research that we have done on courses in public speaking. We have studied their effect on personality, on critical thinking, on attitudes toward speaking, on anxiety while speaking, and--once in a while--even on skill at speaking. The picture that emerges from research on even this simple problem--assessing the success of a single performance course--is ambiguous.[4]

To develop decent tests, not only must we agree among ourselves on what the general goals of each course should be, but we must also translate our general goals into behavioral objectives. And here we encounter another problem. The major value of a good set of behavioral objectives is their high degree of specificity which makes them measurable. But this very value creates a danger. When we insist upon highly specific behavioral objectives, we are likely forcing ourselves to omit some important educational outcomes. For example, one author, sophisticated in educational evaluation, has even made this comment about the use of behavioral objectives in the mathematics program of the primary schools.

> The unfortunate consequence of this atomization is that the interrelatedness of math concepts is lost and the statement is a tedious list of very trivial low-level skills.[5]

If this is a problem with the behavioral goals for primary school mathematics, where there seem to be agreed upon behaviors which pupils should learn, how much more of a problem it is bound to be at the college level, especially in a field such as ours.

In spite of these problems, with the push from an organization such as ours, I am confident that we can develop useful measures which, for comparative purposes, have a high degree of validity. Another of the functions of SCA or ADASC can be to help us gather data from a good sample of departments with similar missions in similar institutions. Using the data from each cluster of similar institutions, we can develop norms against which the effectiveness of the course or cluster in each department can be measured.

With these measures of individual courses and clusters of courses, we will ultimately be able to get back to the evaluation of total departments, and even of colleges and universities. At that point, though, we will be able to evaluate these larger structures not by using a common measure for all students within them, but rather by combining the results of those individual measures which are most appropriate for each student in each institution.[6]

After we have developed reliable and valid measures of effectiveness of courses, clusters of courses, or even departments, colleges, and universities, we will be almost home--though not quite in the door. We will still have the problem of bringing together our measures of effectiveness with the measures of efficiency which are now being refined in the accountability studies. Ultimately, we will come to the point where we must place a dollar value on various kinds and amounts of educational gain. That is, ultimately we must ask of any particular kind or any particular amount of gain, "Is it worth the cost?" For example, how much money is it worth to increase the knowledge of 100 students about communication processes by 10 per cent? Or how much is it worth to decrease the speech anxiety of 20 students by 5 per cent? When we reach these kinds of questions, research and researchers can offer little help. These questions of relative value are ones that must be answered by the society. Hopefully, though, it will be an enlightened society. Here also there is a function for organizations such as the SCA and ADASC. These organizations must be concerned with helping their members to educate the general public and the decision-makers in institutions of higher learning about the value of increasing the communication skills and sophistication of individuals, groups, and organizations.

When we have achieved these ends that I have suggested, evaluation of our programs and our departments should be a great boon to us and to our field.

Footnotes

1. Ellis B. Page, "How We All Failed in Performance Contracting," Educational Psychologist, IX (1972), 40-41.

2. Point suggested by Dewey B. Stuit, "Measuring the Quality of a College or University in Proceedings of the 1961 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, chairman Paul L. Dressel (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1961), p. 78.

3. Rodney T. Hartnett, Accountability in Higher Education (Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), p. 16.

4. For details, see Samuel L. Becker, "Research on Speech Pedagogy," in Dimensions of Rhetorical Scholarship, ed. Roger E. Nebergall (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1963), pp. 31-48.

5. Hartnett, p. 13.

6. The problem of standardizing these varied measures so that they are comparable will be relatively simple since we will be concerned with deviations from norms rather than absolute scores.

ADASC AND THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Ernest E. Ettlich

I have the easy task of pulling points together in order to pose some problems of policy and posture for the ADASC, specifically in relation to the evaluation process. The design of the seminar called, first, for a review of where the organization and profession have come philosophically; second, for an in-depth look at two of the more pressing problems facing department chairmen--the unionization of faculty and the implementation of accountability procedures; and third, a pulling of the two reviews into focus through detailing the implications for the evaluation of faculty and academic programs.

Now the question emerges, what is to be the role of a national organization like the ADASC in such an evaluation? One of the things that gave rise to this seminar topic was the bombardment of my office with requests for recommended consultants and review panels for graduate programs as well as undergraduate programs either in colleges with no speech program but considering the possibility or in colleges establishing a speech program and desiring an evaluation of their proposed program. So the immediate question comes, should ADASC establish a consulting service? We have a model on which to build such a consulting service in the Association of Departments of Geography. For a number of years in geography the same kind of haphazard system of compiling panels for review existed as we have where we write to persons we know and hope that an impartial panel results.

At the founding of the Association of Departments of Geography, a consulting service was established which provides the deans of graduate schools, academic deans, vice presidents academic, provosts, and the like, lists of individuals who have agreed to serve on such panels and who do represent the best in their profession. They provide this list on an individual basis. That is, a list is compiled for each request by level of program. If a school, for instance, seeks the evaluation of a graduate program, the list of names submitted may vary considerably from one for a school seeking an evaluation of a community college program in speech communication. The ADG has even gone so far as to set a standard fee so that a school can bring the best people in the geography profession. The flat rate is established at the federal rate of $125 per day. Such a service for ADASC would provide lists of individuals for the evaluation of degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as the evaluation of total departments. Such a system replaces the haphazard compiling of a panel with a more formal system of referral which guarantees, not only to the department, but to the administrator, an impartial and competent panel. As the panels are now convened, graduate deans often report that reviewers tend to be friends of the department chairmen, friends of the members of the department, and so on. Thus out of a consultancy service comes an impartial list of individuals with clear expertise in the field and power to act for our association. So the first question is, should the ADASC establish such consulting services and what could be the charges of that consulting service.

A second and very related issue is the question of whether or not ADASC then could establish general guidelines to be followed by the reviewers who are on the list. I am not talking about specific guidelines at least at this point but general guidelines. For example, what is the maximum teaching load appropriate for various subjects at various levels. Geographers have set up a sliding scale depending upon the character of the load itself. If the load is entirely lower division, the load would be higher than if the load was entirely at the graduate level. It also changes by the character of the institutions, the character of the program, size of classes, and similar criterion. A second set of guidelines might relate to the programs. For example the guideline might recommend a minimum number of courses at the graduate level required to offer a masters or doctoral program. In addition, their association has adopted specific guidelines such as no new doctoral program shall be endorsed by

their association for the foreseeable future.

A third set of issues emerges from the two papers today. Let us take first the evaluation of professional personnel. In general the studies on the evaluation of professional personnel have been very locally oriented. The question comes, should the ADASC sponsor a broader set of studies on the evaluation of professional personnel within departments--a very sensitive question. It might well be an ADASC-sponsored study on the evaluation of professional personnel would collect the existing evaluation systems that have been developed and report on the efficiency of existing evaluation systems. One result might be, for instance, the publication of a recommended procedure for annual faculty evaluation for retention, salary raises, tenure, and promotion. One alternative to a publication is the one adopted by the Association of Departments of English: the system of seminars for training of department chairmen. The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education through their department chairmen division also sponsored a training program for new chairmen emphasizing faculty evaluation, budget review, and techniques for presenting department needs, positions, and policies to higher administration. The question then is, should ADASC sponsor studies such as these and then develop the means of distributing the material, especially to new chairmen.

A fourth question is, should ADASC establish a program for the recognition of excellence in teaching? Four organizations, that I am aware of, have abandoned in the last year their program for recognizing excellence in teaching. A fifth, the Association of Departments in English, is contemplating their abandonment of the certificate of excellence in teaching. The problem has been the impartial identification of recipients. Do you simply allow every department chairman to nominate one person, or is there a formal evaluation of each individual. Such a system, of course, depends upon the development of some general criteria for the evaluation of teaching as discussed this morning.

In addition are the questions in relation to activity of ADASC and the evaluation of programs. Should the ADASC, for instance, survey the student demands and the placement potentials for various undergraduate and graduate programs and then prepare a list of needed new programs and areas where no new programs should be established nor existing programs expanded. This goes a bit against my own grain, because in essence what we are talking about in special listings and the resulting use is the limitation of student choice. However, this may very well be a policy that ADASC wishes to consider. Should we recommend the establishment of programs only where an established need for program graduates has been demonstrated. In the same area should ADASC sponsor studies to determine guidelines for funding and staffing programs in speech communication. Some of us do need the help of friends in the computing area called Derived Data for Program Budgeting. Some of us need the kinds of information that would help us in defending the efficiency of our programs. At the same time we also need normative and ideal data in relation to defending the quality of a program, as well as material and personnel resources necessary for the maintenance of such quality programs. For this you need studies of programs which can develop criteria and data suitable for cost accounting. Let me suggest a fourth general area: should the ADASC assist departments in minority recruitment. A number of organizations including the American Speech and Hearing Association have recently begun crash programs to recruit ethnic minority students into their graduate programs. ASHA, like SCA, has a fairly respectable male/female ratio. But the representation of ethnic minorities is extremely low. I'm sure that many of you are faced with affirmative action programs at this point--affirmative action programs which require the hiring of ethnic minority faculty when there are no more ethnic minority faculty available. Obviously, as has been stated several times, the problem is not going to be solved until we get to the graduate schools and increase the minority graduate student population. Is this an appropriate activity for the association of departments?

Finally, should the association of departments begin to specialize its activities? About five or six letters that I received this spring advocate a division in ADASC into two types of divisions at the national level. First, the establishment of divisions by level of instruction, so that you would have the secondary school divisions, community college divisions, four-year institutions, and graduate institutions. A second set of divisions would be by character of institution, so that the state institutions facing accountability through state coordinating councils can get together and compare on their problems. Another set of letters advocates the establishment of regional associations so that the ADASC could meet in conjunction with the various regional associations.

My goal this afternoon was simply to raise questions. Developing a means to answer these questions is the focus of tomorrow morning's activities, where we take these issues and others that you may wish to raise and begin to develop positions, policy statements, in regard to them. The real question that I am asking and I think the whole point of all of the discussion that we've heard the last few days is the question of what should be the professional function of the Association of Departments.

POSITION PAPER ON CONSULTING SERVICE

The committee appointed to study the matter of a Consulting Service recommends that ADASC take immediate steps to implement such a service and make it available to schools and departments requesting advice about speech communication problems. It is felt that requests for such service might come from the following:

1. Departments initiating their own self-evaluation studies.
2. For various reasons administrative levels above the departments might request such aid.
3. Professional organizations might also call upon such a service.

These reasons are not meant to be exhaustive but are predicted ones and ones that the committee discussed.

If a Consultancy Service should be established by ADASC the committee agrees that any list of available consultants should include representatives from three broad categories:

1. All geographic areas should be represented, and we suggest that the regional speech associations be used if nominations of persons for such a list is to be undertaken.
2. All academic areas within the field of speech communication should be included, and we suggest that the nine divisions of SCA would be adequate as a guideline for such assurance. (You will remember that these divisions are forensics, instructional development, interpersonal and group communication, interpretation, public address, rhetorical and communication theory, speech science, theatre, and mass communication.)
3. Different levels of institutions would have to be represented. Special care should be taken to prepare a pool that would include persons with experience from the following:
   a. Secondary schools
   b. undergraduate four-year institutions
   c. community colleges
   d. graduate programs which offer the Master's Degree
   e. institutions granting the Ph.D.

In any selection criteria, it should be remembered also that a list should include persons representing different sizes of institutions and academic programs.

Committee Members: Hazel Heiman, Randall Capps, Don R. Cain, Ray Cheydleur, Robert Underhill.

POSITION PAPER ON PERSONNEL EVALUATION

Because formalized, systematic evaluation is everywhere a part of college and university life, ADASC feels it may be useful to identify measures of productivity suitable for Speech Communication faculty members and administrators. We take the position that any system for such evaluation should embrace the following criteria, in spirit if not in word:

1. A systematic, periodic evaluation should be used in determining salary increases, tenure, promotion, and termination. Such evaluation should serve primarily to improve the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and service.
2. The system of evaluation, including both evaluation criteria and a procedure for appeal of the result of the evaluation, should be clearly stated to a prospective faculty member at the time of hiring, and reviewed periodically.
3. The system should include evaluation of quality as well as of quantity of productivity.
4. The system should include input from multiple sources. We recommend that there be student evaluation, self evaluation, peer evaluation, and administrator evaluation.
5. The individual being evaluated should contribute to the determination of those things on which the evaluation is to be based.

Discussion of the Foregoing Proposals

Evaluation is practiced whenever decisions are made concerning salary, tenure, promotion, and termination. Too often the evaluation is purely subjective, is based on general impressions in lieu of carefully collected data, occurs only at the time of such decisions, is not at all systematic, and is not based on those things which the individual being evaluated presumes to be his responsibility.

Even where there is system and objectivity, the individual being evaluated may have no opportunity to contribute. Speech Communication faculties include diverse specialists. The productivity of a theatre director can seldom be measured fairly with the same instrument as that applied to an audiologist. The nature of the research that goes into a period play is quite different from the experiment done in a speech laboratory. Yet, such differences need to be considered when evaluating productivity. Thus the need for periodic, systematic, joint determination of the bases for each individual's evaluation.

With individually adapted instruments completed periodically by students, the professor himself, his fellow teachers and researchers, and by his immediate supervisor (administrator), data is collected from many sources and should lead to a broader knowledge and, hopefully, a more objective evaluation.

The individual should know on what he is to be evaluated before he accepts the position. Advising him of such bases before employment and reviewing them with him periodically forewarns him and gives him an opportunity to do what is expected. It must be clear, however, that these criteria are truly the bases of the final evaluation.

From time to time in the life of a professional, circumstances afford new opportunities for research or service projects, and such opportunities may change work priorities. The bases for evaluation, therefore, should remain negotiable between the individual and his administrative officer. At times it might be necessary to deny a recommended change, but such decisions should be made after careful consideration by all parties involved.

Qualitative as well as quantitative measurements should be taken. A large number of publications, for example, could be of limited significance unless weighed against the nature of the work, the periodicals in which they appear, and perhaps the relationship of the author to the editor. The number of miles traveled by the debate team is meaningless unless worthwhile educational objectives are reached. It is sometimes tempting to give our time to personally rewarding experiences rather than to those things that need to be done.

Any evaluation procedure developed may result in seemingly unfair results. Mistakes in judgment, in interpretation, in synthesis can be made, because it will always be a human being making the final evaluation and recommendation. It is essential, therefore, that the evaluated faculty member be provided an appeal procedure. There should be a clearly defined method for appealing results, and all parties should know what they are. This is consistent with the accepted concept of due process.

Sometimes an individual places high priority on activities which his administrative officer does not consider part of his job. If the individual to be evaluated is consulted when the bases of the evaluation are determined, he may be able to help the administrative officer understand the importance of a given activity. At least such a procedure provides an opportunity for each party to discuss and better understand the position as seen by the other.

Committee Members: E. Samuel Dudley, Dwight Freshley, Goodwin Berquist, Dave Schuelke, Robert S. Quinn.

POSITION PAPER ON FACULTY EXCHANGE

The Committee on Faculty Exchange wishes to submit the following recommendations:

1. That exchanges between faculty of member institutions be encouraged and promoted by the Association.
2. That the faculty exchanges be for a period of one semester; the possibility of longer exchanges should be considered as well.
3. That the salary of the exchange faculty be paid by his "home" institution lest his retirement, insurance, and other benefits be adversely affected.
4. That where possible and feasible, arrangements to exchange housing should be encouraged.
5. That SPECTRA might serve as a vehicle for surveying interest of Association members in faculty exchange.
6. That sources of funding to help cover relocation costs be explored.
7. That the mechanics needed to facilitate the program be handled by the Staff Coordinator. If this is not feasible, the Committee on Faculty Exchange should assume this responsibility. The minimal expenses involved (stationery, postage) should be borne by the Association.

Committee Members: Carol Cole, Ronald Gee, Mary Musgrove, Gladys Forde.

POSITION PAPER ON PROGRAM EVALUATION

The report of this task force has been prepared through correspondence between the members and confirmed by conference call to approve the final draft. On August 11, the chairman sent a first letter to the others, enclosing a proposal to develop career curricula by testing the market place, requesting reactions. In addition, thinking was requested on the subject of basic oral language skills development and task force members were asked to add any relevant ideas that they wished to discuss. Both members responded at length. This report is a synopsis of those responses and will contain a set of statements upon which the task force appears to agree at the outset, an additional list of statements which require more discussion, and finally, some areas where the task force appears to agree that immediate planning and/or research attack ought to be made. Since the task force has not met, this report has not been constituted through appropriate group procedure and that action should be the next step.

Statements upon which the task force appears to agree:

1. At this moment in academic history we need to do all we can so that career opportunities become available to holders of degrees in speech communication.
2. We c[illegible] retain the values of education for life at the same time that we train students for careers. This assumption is crucial to the maintenance of significance and worth of a university education as opposed to vocational training.
3. We consider our relation to liberal education to be a vital one.
4. Preparing people to do what is required of them in a career of a specific nature and preparing them to decide what they must know and be able to do at some unpredictable future date as a direct result of learning accomplished in a given course or curriculum are not quite the same objectives in ... (our) system of program evaluation.
5. Determination should be made as to those behavioral objectives that can be accomplished in the classroom or laboratory and those that should be acquired on the job.
6. We do not accept lightly the assumption that we are universally engaged in vocational or career education.

Statements for which agreement has not been established:

1. As our field moves closer and closer to the social sciences there will be a much greater need for communication specialists and perhaps we should begin training them now.
2. We must begin to blur the lines between modes of communication and simply concern ourselves with communication.

3. All of us involved in the teaching of communication begin to understand that we are involved in one task, not many and that we need to work together for the development of a meaningful curriculum for kindergarten to college to improve communicative skills.
4. The training of students in communicative perception may be more important than training in communicative performance.
5. The most important task we can set ourselves to is to determine the nature of our field. We need to determine first of all how wide a range is covered by the rubric "Speech Communication". We need to find out whether there is any centrality at all and the directions we are moving. After that, we need to make some recommendations about what our central tendency should be, although, to some extent, that answer was provided at New Orleans and Pheasant Run. We need to then make recommendations at all levels concerning the kind of curriculum development which will lead to these goals.
6. The search for a sufficient lead angle to life application for a given course could inhibit and perhaps seriously damage the capacity for contemplative social criticism and reflection on longer range social and personal values. Immediate tool application is to deepen learning, not to tie the instruction to the "now" world.
7. Many marketable course objectives in 1972, when sophomore Jones enrolls in Communication 101, may not be at all viable or at least may be rather wide of the mark in 1975 when Jones issues forth to market his learned behaviors and insights.
8. Many departments of communication have expressed concern about our tendency toward vocational schoolitis. From the negative comparison to a vocational school to the affirmative comparison with a medical or law school requires only a small substantive extension. The professional school has a showpiece production center, so does the vocational school, so do we.
9. The objectives we share with professional schools but not with vocational schools are perspective, standards, and ethics. In sum, we aim to create students who know their job, set very high standards for themselves which they are confident of achieving because they have done it and had their work compared and criticized by the best authorities, and who have a high sense of awareness of the ethical standards necessary to the legitimate conduct of their professional activity.
10. The finest medical schools in the world have the finest hospitals. The reason they do is that the hospital is a showpiece for the school and its faculty. Research and teaching in such a showpiece becomes useful and meaningful because the faculty out of its own excellence is contributing to the knowledge store of its profession and imparting high standards to its students. Through the development of our own communication activities we have the same capacity for imparting high standards to our work and our students.
11. A fine professional school quickly becomes the place to go to employ a consultant, commission some specific piece of applied research to solve a problem, or to get a job done that needs doing in the relevant fields. Likewise, Departments of Communication must become the source of consulting research, information, and service to the professionals in communication in the regions that we serve. If our competencies are not up to that level, then we must get them there as quickly as possible. We already have such a capability in many areas and lack only application to our own production and research to make our showpiece media operations and skills of our graduates bring us the reputation quickly.

Finally, there are some areas where the task force appears to agree that immediate planning and/or research attack ought to be made:

1. We have no adequate standard method for testing oral language skills, conceptual or perceptual, and an inter-organization committee from ADASC, SCA, NCTE, etc., should be formed to develop research designs and seek funding.
2. The business of determining parameters of careerism and its true implications for speech communication should be attacked immediately. All our scholars look harassed when threatened with a "trade school" identity, yet they admit, when pressed, that we are universally engaged in vocational education in teacher training, theatre (in a limited sense), speech pathology/audiology, journalism, broadcasting, film, and business and industrial communi-

cation. All of these training areas also have relevant industries seeking students with some skill or knowledge -- yet understanding, perspective, and capacity for ethical leadership must be equally important. Can one program attack all these identities simultaneously?

3. Test results for the language deficient in the last two years have clearly revealed that massive government spending in the sixties to solve this problem has been a colossal waste. This profession must attack that problem area more effectively. We may lose significant ground if we do not.
4. In moving to meet new challenges and new program requirements, the speech communication profession must not lose sight of those important objectives that it has already been carrying out.

In brief, early commentary on program development by the task force indicates clearly that all agree that there is much to be done in program development. Classrooms, internships, field methods, research in new pedagogies, and other applied work establishing and evaluating what we do and what we ought to do in executing our primary purpose in the classroom lags far behind our accomplishments in knowledge of our field, education for the many, and expanding curricula. Further, any work that this task force accomplishes in a field like Speech Communication will be obsolete before it is expressed. Hence, ADASC should consider this task force or its equivalent a formal working body to meet in workshop form on program development as frequently as possible and make continuing recommendations to the profession.

Committee Members: S. P. Gwin, Herman Cohen, Gale L. Richards.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Herman Cohen is a professor and the department chairman at the Pennsylvania State University in University Park.

Robert Vogelsang is not only the Executive Secretary of the Western Speech Communication Association, but also serves as the department chairman at Portland State University in Oregon.

Arthur C. Meyer is chairman of the Communication Division at Florissant Valley Community College in St. Louis, Missouri. He is completing his doctorate in speech at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

Michael F. Shugrue is the Staff Coordinator of the Association of Departments of English, an affiliated organization of the Modern Language Association.

Robert N. Hall is Staff Coordinator of the ADASC and editor of the BULLETIN.

Anita Taylor is a professor and chairwoman at Florissant Valley Community College in St. Louis. This year she is an A.C.E. Fellow doing her internship in the chancellor's office of the Dallas County Community College District in Texas.

L. Leroy Cowperthwaite is Dean of the School of Speech, Kent State University in Ohio.

James E. Roever is an associate professor at Queens College of the City University of New York.

Robert C. Jeffrey is President of the Speech Communication Association and a professor and chairman at the University of Texas at Austin.

Samuel L. Becker is First Vice President of the SCA and a professor and chairman at the University of Iowa in Iowa City.

Ernest E. Ettlich was a founder and the first President of the ADASC. He also is a professor and chairman at Washington State University in Pullman.

The ADASC BULLETIN is a quarterly publication of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication. The BULLETIN is edited by Robert N. Hall, ADASC Staff Coordinator and published by the ADASC, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y. 10001.

Membership in the ADASC is open to any Speech Department or administrative unit at an annual dues of $25.00. Inquiries should be directed to the Staff Coordinator.

Articles are welcomed for consideration for publication in the BULLETIN. Manuscripts should be typed double spaced. Two copies of each manuscript should be submitted.